THE CONCEPT OF PERSONHOOD IN THE THOUGHT OF MARTIN BUBER, DAISETZ SUZUKI AND MUHAMMAD IQBAL

BY

ATBONTON
NATIVIDAD G. BARRANDA

A Dissertation presented to the General Faculty
of the Claremont Graduate School in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

1968

We, the undersigned certify that we have read this dissertation and approved it as adequate in scope and quality for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Floyd H. Ross
Visiting Examiner

Donald H. Rhoades
Faculty Reader

Hans C.
Faculty Reader

Supervisory Committee

John A. Hutchison
Chairman

Donald H. Rhoades

Hans C.

PREFACE

This essay is an endeavor to point out and explore the concept of personhood from a philosophical, psychological and religious point of view. This perennial question, what is Man? finds definitive expression in Martin Buber's, Daisetz Suzuki's and Muhammad Iqbal's thoughts and writings. Thus the main objective of this essay is to investigate and to understand personality as these three men of different backgrounds and different religious traditions examine selfhood.

This investigation has two fundamental assumptions. First of all, there is a felt-need to know about the self and the person-in-relation. Many men of old have traveled with others in our age on this know-thyself-journey. And this ancient command "know thyself" has become a crucial problem of contemporary philosophy, anthropology and psychology. A better understanding of oneself leads to a deeper view of one's relationship and outlooks toward life. Knowing one's metaphysical views somehow helps in understanding one's actions and goals in life.

Secondly, the need to listen to other faiths becomes imperative. As Paul Tillich reminded his Television audience in his dialogue with Carl Rogers in 1965, listening ears enrich us with a sense of understanding and empathy in our relationship with ourselves and with other people. There are striking and important similarities among the thoughts of Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal, three germinal minds of different cultures and religious traditions.

I do not claim to be phenomenological in my approach to this theme of personhood. I just endeavor to understand what personality is and allow Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal to tell me their views and ideas. In the course of my attempt to understand each man, some questions guided me which are recorded in Chapter 1. I am sure some of my biases and prejudices as well as sympathies can easily be detected.

The importance of knowing something about each person, in terms of autobiographical and biographical facts, has been pressed to my mind in my study of Hasidism where the personality of the Zaddik, especially Baal Shem Tov, takes the place of doctrine, as Gershom Scholem has rightly pointed out. Doctrines, beliefs and neatly arranged ideas are, it is true, very useful, but to me their application in one's daily actions, and their relevance and practicableness in daily life is of greater importance. The interplay, the dynamics and telling effects in one's daily life far outweigh the handiness or usefulness of having and knowing them. This is a growing awareness on my part with regard to the close relationship of beliefs and actions. Somehow one's beliefs determine the actions as well as the means or ways and meaning one has in his day-to-day existence and his relationship with others, his spheres of activities and plans. Smith has hinted this point to me in his book, The Meaning and End of Religion. He examined the history and community of different faiths from the Christian to the Zoroastrian, and brought them into a unified focus by concentrating on the individual man and the "transcendent" that his tradition has for him.

The format of this essay is, thus, threefold. First, it tries to present a clear definition of the nature and structure of the "self" as reflected in the thoughts of Martin Buber, of D.T. Suzuki, and of Muhammad Iqbal. In the individual treatment of the three writers, I have included some facets of their personalities hoping that we can gain glimpses of their own insights into what is man?. Secondly, an attempt is made to compare and contrast Buber,Suzuki and Iqbal respecting their concepts of the self. Thirdly, it endeavors to present a final appraisal as to the validity of the person-in-relation.

An introduction ventures to define the problem and to present the predicament of the modern man as he heeds the ancient command. There are stated reasons why I selected Buber,Suzuki and Iqbal.

Chapter 11 gives Buber's clear statement of the fundamental features of Buber's "person", and his twofold worlds, twofold attitudes, and twofold relations. Here we get Buber's concept of responsibility, the claim of every hour and event, and the meaning of speech and symbols as techniques of realization.

Chapter 111 sets forth Suzuki's view of selfhood as seen through the eyes of Zen Buddhism. Man's enlightenment or satori which is possible in the daily activities of any human being is described, not to mention Suzuki's emphasis of personal experience.

Chapter 1V explores Iqbal's theory of the human ego, the education of the ego for community, and the Ultimate Ego's place in Islamic community.

A critical analysis of the thoughts of Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal will be in Chapter V to bring together their illuminating insights on personhood. Some residual difficulties are noted too.

Chapter V1 is composed of a summary and some conclusions of these three men, organizing the same around the different types of mysticism.

In this essay I have received assistance and encouragement from many sources. Librarians at the libraries of the University of California, Los Angeles, of the University of Southern California, of the University of Dayton, of Wright State University, and of Antioch College have made their documents and books available, to supplement what books we have in the Claremont's Honnold Library and School of Theology Library.

I am grateful to my three Committee chairmen(in one

year's time)-- Dr. Robert Meyners for helping me through my Qualifying Examination Stage and reading my Buber section; Dr. Floyd H.Ross for his constant moral support and assistance in reading and editing my Suzuki section; and Dr. John A. Hutchison for consenting to be my permanent chairman. To my doctoral committee, namely; Dr. John A.Hutchison for his constant guidance and direction; Dr. Hans Ruyter for his valuable suggestions; and Dr. Donald Rhoads for his incisive criticisms; I offer my eternal gratitude. My sincere appreciation is due to Dr. Floyd Ross for serving as the visiting examiner during the Oral Examination and defense of this dissertation.

A debt of gratitude cannot be repaid to Dr. Alfred Knox for his moral support and editing of my first five papers.

I cannot forget the important and valuable assistance of the following organizations and school agencies for their scholarships: Claremont Graduate School and University Center; International Christian Foundation; La Sertoma International; PEO International Peace Scholarship; United Church of Christ,Claremont; the Legal Fraternity of Los Angeles and the Blaisdell Institute,Claremont,California.

CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

Chapter
1. INTRODUCTION 1

    The Self-Affirmation of Man
    Paradox and Problem

11. BUBER'S UNDERSTANDING OF PERSONHOOD 11

    Preliminary Remarks
    Beginning with Oneself
    The I-Thou and I-It Relations
    The Threefold Living Relation
    Theory of Responsibility
    Man's Turning and God's Grace

111. SUZUKI'S UNDERSTANDING OF PERSONHOOD 106

    Preliminary Remarks
    The Soul of Man
    Freedom to Be Original
    Prayna-Dhyana
    Zen Methods of Discipline
    No-Mind
    Satori

1V. IQBAL'S UNDERSTANDING OF PERSONHOOD 152

    Preliminary Remarks
    The Human Ego
    Love for the Education of the Ego
    The Community and Ultimate Ego

V. BUBER,SUZUKI AND IQBAL 190

The Social Self and the Temple of the Soul
The Participant and His Positive Attitudes toward Life
Self and Society
Modes of Communication and Speech
Community: The Social as Moral
Man and God as Correlative Concepts
Silence and nonknowledge

Vl. SUMMARY AND SOME CONCLUSIONS 232

Man and His Existence
Man the Indivisible Unit
Self and Community
Man, Speech and Symbol
God in the Community

APPENDIX 251

BIBLIOGRAPHY 257

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Self-Affirmation of Man

Who am I? This is one basic question which every man of any clime asks at one time or the other in his lifetime. Different people of varied experiences and orientations have asked it in different ways and styles. Scholars, teachers and students, joining hands with ordinary men and women, youth and children, have used different words in asking it. This question is a perennial concern.

Long ago Socrates said: "Know Thyself."[1] The dictum of the Upanishads is "Know Thyself" (atmanam Viddhi).[2] Like Pope who said that the noblest study of mankind is man himself, the philosopher Malebranche, the most significant of the French philosophers who continued the Cartesian investigations, wrote: "Of all human knowledge the knowledge of man is the most deserving of his study."[3]

---

[1] Quoted in William Turner, History of Philosophy (New York: Gin & Co., 1929), p. 80.

[2] P. T. Raju, ed., The Concept of Man (Nebraska: Johnson Publishing Co., 1960), p. 307.

[3] Martin Buber, Between Man and Man, trans. Ronald G. Smith (London: Regan Paul Tranch, Trubner & Co., 1947), p. 118.

An old cobbler in Edinburgh began each day with a prayer: "O Lord, give me a high opinion of myself." Wordsworth, in an age when man found the meaninglessness of life, declared:

> ...trailing clouds of glory do we come
> from God, who is our home.[4]

"What piece of work is man!" These are Shakespeare's lines. Immanuel Kant, one of the thinkers of modern times, has summed up all his great thoughts into just two sentences which are expressed in a familiar passage: "Two things fill me with constantly increasing admiration and awe the longer and more earnestly I reflect on them, the starry heavens without and the moral law within."[5] The Psalmist exclaimed this sentiment in wonder and awe when he asked:

> What is man that Thou art mindful of him?
> and the son of man, that thou visitest him?
> For thou hast made him a little lower than
> the angels, and has crowned him with glory
> honour....[6]

Today's Challenge: Paradox and Problem

Today in this age of Science, this fundamental question What is man? poses a bold and fresh challenge with a paradox and a problem. Men move forward with ever-accelerating tempo. An awesome paradox confronts each of us. On one side, man through technical progress acquires more and more control over the external world. Men seem to have complete "dominion over the works of thy hands; and ... all things under his feet." On the other hand, there is a crisis and revolution in modern culture and in man's knowledge of himself and his human activity. There is an affluence of material possessions and intellectual discoveries. Yet, there is a seeming indifference and apathy among people which cause feelings of isolation and despair, and of apparent meaninglessness which brings a purposeless whirlwind of activities and projects. Amidst the confusion of technical advancement and programs which cause tension and serious concern[7] rather than sources of creative interests, simple reminders of work-a-day world and common ordinary things like sunshine, dawn and a priceless treasure of insights and values from work, the sense of accomplishment and the joys of relationships and friendship are very timely and refreshing.

---

[4] William Wordsworth, Ode Intimations of Immortality stanza 5.

[5] Newton Stallknecht, History of Western Philosophy (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1961), p. 145.

[6] Psalm 8 King James.

Not only is there a paradox, but there is also a problem to modern man. Man is a problem to himself, and there is "Man's inhumanity to man". Men all over the world, amidst a deep disquietude and perhaps in utter hopelessness, pause to ask: "What is man? Who am I? Is there meaning at all? Youth, especially those who are apparently perplexed about the world's situations, seriously ponder on Why am I here? What can I do? How can I help in solving some of the world's problems and needs? How can I relate myself meaningfully to others?

---

[7] Jerome Echkstein, "The Fall and Rise of Man," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. V, 1, Fall, 1965, 68-81.

Aware of moral sickness, political conflict, spiritual discontent, mental anxiety with questions so disturbing and yet pregnant with significant and fruitful implications, man is, on the other hand, comforted with the revival of great interest in the nature of man and of human value. Philosophical as well as psychological groups have advanced in their inquiry and interest in anthropology. Religious and theological circles have explored with fresh zeal the meaning, the moral responsibility, and the destiny of man. Noting the shifting of philosophical interest from God, matter and science to man, Radhakrishnan joins many philosophers to examine the concept of man in different philosophical and religious traditions.[8] He writes: "The world has found itself as one body. But physical unity and economic interdependence are not by themselves sufficient to create a universal human community, a sense of personal relationships among men. Though this human consciousness was till recently limited to the members of the political states, there has been rapid extension of it after the War. The modes and customs of all men are not a part of the consciousness of all men. Man has become the spectator of man. A new humanism is on the horizon. But this time it embraces the whole of mankind."[9] Indeed what was on the horizon in 1940 is now a distinct phenomenon. There is urgency in asking the question: what is man? In such urgency there is a cloud of despair; however, there is also a ray of hope.

---

[8] Raju, Radhakrishnan, (eds) The Concept of Man, See also Paul Le Fevre, Understanding of Man,(Pennsylvania: Westminster Press,1960)

There are indeed many ways of viewing selfhood. Many philosophers and religious men, both young and old, have tried to answer these fundamental questions--"What is man? What is the meaning and value of human activity?" These, for example, have been viewed through the eyes of man in the Judeo-Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, Greek and Chinese traditions.[10] In this present study an attempt shall be made to view selfhood in three ways. More specifically, this study will be on Martin Buber's view of man (representing the Judeo-Christian tradition), on Daisetz Suzuki's understanding of personhood (of the Zen Buddhist thoughts), and on Muhammad Iqbal (of the Islamic tradition). Primarily, this writer will endeavor to investigate Buber's understanding of personhood, so that at least half of this study will be on Buber's thoughts and works. Secondarily, an attempt will be made to present both Suzuki's and Iqbal's views of selfhood. A dialogue among them may prove enlightening in our investigation.

---

[9] S. Radhakrishnan, Eastern Religions and Western Thought (London: Oxford University Press, 1949), p. vii.

[10] Radhakrishnan, et al., eds., The Concept of Man. See also Paul Le Fevre, Understanding of Man.

Will an understanding of each thinker as a man, his life, and times help in studying each man's views on personhood? Yes, I maintain; therefore, some biographical facts of Buber (1878-1965), Suzuki (1870-1966) and Iqbal (1873-1938) will be included to illumine our own understanding of each man's insightful interpretation and keen observation. W. C. Smith[11] supports me in this contention as he points out the importance of the personal life of the believer to be relevant and telling in any study of man's faith and his tradition.

What exactly is Buber's definitive statement on personhood? Will Suzuki and Iqbal support most of his presuppositions and ideas on man's self-authenticity, role, value and destiny? If so, what are these views and presuppositions which are similar to those of Buber? How and why will each man differ in their understanding of selfhood?

---

[11] Winfred C. Smith, The Meaning and End of Religion (New York: The American Library, 1964).

Will a study of Suzuki's and Iqbal's views of selfhood enrich our own investigation and appreciation of Buber's view? What value is there in studying primarily Buber's views in the light of two religious and philosophical thinkers?

"The fundamental fact of human existence is neither the individual as such nor the aggregate as such. Each, considered by itself, is a mighty abstraction.... The fundamental fact of human existence is man with man. What is peculiarly characteristic of the human world is above all that something takes place between one being and another the like of which can be found nowhere in nature",[12] writes Buber. This concept of the "social self" is a new hypothesis[13] which has productive implications in different fields like philosophy, ethics, theology, social psychology, politics. The self is the "social being, the I-Thou dialogic creature", the "person" who finds his essence, integrity and meaning essentially in his relationship with another 'thou' manifoldly thought of. This concept posits the nature of and growth of the "self system" in a community of "others" who find themselves claimed and who in turn address others. Realizing the importance of knowing one's self and his relations to others in this "de-humanizing age of science", Snyder expresses the almost universal desire of every man when he writes: "The disquietudes aroused by the rapid scientific advances going on all around us are basically social problems, and must find their solutions in the social sciences. We must in all sincerity pin our hopes on the better management of social relationships, especially at the international level."[14]

---

[12] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 203.

[13] Paul Pfeutze, Self, Society, Existence (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961). Buber may disagree with the view since the I-Thou idea is as ancient and timely as the Old Testament time.

Like Buber, who believes in the hallowing of the everyday, and the sanctifying of the profane which tries to heal the breach between "religion" and everyday life, Suzuki writes that Zen is a matter of personal experience in the here and now of the human situation. Life must be grasped in the midst of its flow.[15] Suzuki supports those who argue that religion based solely on science is not enough. "There are certain 'Mythological' elements in every one of us, which cannot be altogether lost in favor of sciences. This is a conviction I have come to. By this I do not mean that a religion is not to undergo a rigorous purging of all its 'impure' elements."[16]

One of the essential teachings of Zen Buddhism, notes

---

[14] L. Snyder, "Human Individuality in Modern Civilization," Annals of the Japan Association for Philosophy of Science, Vol. 2, 1, February, 1961.

[15] Daisetz Suzuki, Introduction to Zen Buddhism (New York: Philosophical Library, 1949).

[16] Suzuki, "Introduction: A Glimpse of Paul Carsus," J. M. Kitagawa, ed., Modern Trends in World Religions (La Salle: Open Court, 1959), pp. xl-lx.

Suzuki, is to see into one's nature, whereby one attains Buddhahood. Is this similar to Buber's "inborn thou" in every human being who has potentiality to have an encounter with other beings, sentient or non-sentient? Buber believes that all beings are "thous" with whom one should have an I-Thou relation. Is Suzuki's assertion that "all beings - sentient - are not to be conquered and subjugated but all friends to be cherished and beloved"[17] in the same spirit as Buber's dialogic relation where the "other" is and should never be used and controlled? An effort to answer these questions and others will be in Chapter III.

On another side of the globe is a lawyer-philosopher, poet and writer of Islamic background who was proclaiming the cultivation of the Self or Ego. Muhammad Iqbal, born at Sialkot in the Punjab, studied and was influenced by Western thinkers like Nietzsche, Bergson and George Bernard Shaw. He summoned the Muslim to "exalt his Ego so high that God himself would consult him before determining his destiny." He saw "the universe as itself growing and maturing in dynamic creation, ever moving toward an unrealized perfection."[18]

A resurgence of deep interest in the works, writings and life of Iqbal is evident as more books by and on him are being translated into English and made available for students of philosophy, poetry, religion and Islamic studies. Showing his gaining popularity and influence since his death in 1938, Cragg notes that "it would not be improper to regard him as the patron saint of Pakistan where Iqbal Day is a national festival."[19] Chapter IV will consist of the discussion of Iqbal's views and thoughts on selfhood.

---

[17] Suzuki, Japanese Buddhism (Japan: Board of Tourist Industry, 1938).

[18] Kenneth Cragg, The Call of the Minaret (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 64.

Who is man? Is man just a bundle of atoms and molecules or a mass of stimuli, reactions and urges whose behavior is determined by psychological process of which he is not aware of? Is man a thing that can be manipulated and used for the total good of the group or nation? Does he have any potentialities for goodness and creativity? Can he decide by and for himself what and when, and how he should live?

Should man be related to others in order to be a whole person? If so, what is this relation with others? How should he meaningfully relate himself? What is human fulfillment? And where is the way? With these questions in mind, let us now proceed to discuss Buber's understanding of personhood.

---

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 63-65.

CHAPTER II

BUBER'S UNDERSTANDING OF PERSONHOOD

Preliminary Remarks

Buber's I and Thou[1] (1923) is now a classic which shows the maturity of his thoughts on the development of his philosophy of dialogue. Beginning from experience[2] rather than abstract thought, I and Thou stresses out "what is the human in man". "It is this approach to philosophy that has made Buber's thought a part of that confluence and divergence of streams of thought known as existentialism."[3] At the same time, Buber, though he does not neglect the emphasis of thinkers such as Soren Kierkegaard and Jean-Paul Sartre on the existential subject, seems much more interested, together with thinkers like Gabriel Marcel and Franz Rosenzweig, in exploring the positive constructive dimensions of human experience and of dialogue. In this work, he introduced the fundamental insight that permeates all his work and thinking, and this insight is "real life is meeting" and that man may be related to nature, to man and to the fruits of human creativity in two ways. Both I-Thou and I-It relationships are important and necessary for the essence of man and fulfillment of human activity. The crucial point in both individual and group life, and in culture is which of these two orientations will be controlling and dominant.

---

[1] I and Thou (2nd ed.), trans. Ronald G. Smith (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958).

[2] If we use Buber's categories of "Relation" and "Experience" which are used in I and Thou, experience here means "Relation", the I-Thou encounter, in contrast to "Experience" which is I-It attitude of using and controlling.

[3] Martin Friedman, "Introductory Essay," Martin Buber, The Knowledge of Man (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1965), p. 11.

However, it is in his book, Between Man and Man[4] (1947) that Buber specifically lists some of the problems which are implicitly raised by the study of the "wholeness of man", and he lists the following as among the problems which are implicitly raised by such an interest:

> Man's special place in the cosmos, his connexion with destiny, his relation to the world of things, his understanding of his fellowmen, his existence as a being that knows it must die, his attitude in all the ordinary and extraordinary encounters with the mystery with which his life is shot through.[5]

This latter work, a collection of five essays, also "fills out and applies" what is said in his now classic small book "with particular regard to the needs of our time."[6]

---

[4] Between Man and Man, trans. Ronald G. Smith (New York: Macmillan, 1947).

[5] Ibid., pp. 19, 120.

[6] Ibid., p. 27.

In Pointing The Way[7] (1909-1954), Buber records his ultimate thoughts on many central problems in our culture. The life-long struggles toward authentic existence are revealed, showing how Buber, originally a mystic who relished the feeling of being 'elevated above life', responds to the crises and challenges of the 20th century. He discovers that the way of genuine I and Thou dialogue means resolute, existential encounter with the complexities of the contemporary world.

Readers of Buber have been perplexed about his metaphysical views of existence and self. Pfeutze,[8] who has received Buber's written statement of having no metaphysics, tried very hard to present systematically Buber's views on existence and self, and destiny. Friedman whose book, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue,[9] is a good introduction to Buber's work, struggled to state Buber's position and finally quoted Buber himself: "I have occasionally described my standpoint to my friends as the 'narrow ridge'. I wanted by this to express that I did not rest on the broad upland of a system that includes a series of sure statements about the absolute, but on a narrow rocky ridge between the gulfs where there is no sureness of expressible knowledge but the certainty of meeting what remains undisclosed."[10] This phrase aptly characterizes the quality and significance of Buber's life and thought. It illustrates both the "holy insecurity" of his existentialist philosophy and also the I-Thou or dialogical philosophy which he has formulated as a genuine third alternative to the insistent either-or's of our own age. "Buber's 'narrow ridge' is no 'happy middle' which ignores the reality of paradox and contradiction in order to escape from the suffering they produce. It is rather a paradoxical unity of what one usually understands only as alternatives - I and thou, love and justice, dependence and freedom,....."[11] Indeed because of this quality of Buber's thought and subtle ways of sharing his ideas, many find Buber's works very difficult to understand and to expound.

---

[7] Pointing the Way: Collected Essays, trans. M. S. Friedman (New York: Harper & Row, 1963).

[8] Pfeutze, Self, Society, Existence, pp. 343-44. He wrote Buber about the latter's metaphysics.

[9] Life of Dialogue (New York: Harper & Row, 1955).

With the publication of The Knowledge of Man,[12] we can now scan his most systematic and explicit views of his philosophy. This volume completes the last and one of the most meaningful stages in the development of his philosophical thought. "If we must characterize Buber at all," Friedman writes, "we can best call him a philosophical anthropologist. In doing so, we do not limit the significance of Buber's philosophy to the human, but we recognize that man's access to being, according to Buber, is not through Plato's ideal forms or Heidegger's being that shines forth in the existent, but through 'the between'--the dialogue between man and the existent over against him'".[13]

---

[10] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 184.

[11] Friedman, Martin Buber..., p. 3.

[12] Buber, The Knowledge of Man.

Before we proceed to discuss Buber's views on man's essence and fulfillment which are deeply embedded in his philosophy of dialogue, let us look at Buber's life.

Martin Buber is a celebrated Jewish religious philosopher. Born in Vienna in 1878, he was reared and brought up in the Galician home of his grandfather, Solomon Buber, who was himself a well-known scholar. The atmosphere of this home introduced Buber into a thorough Jewish education in the traditional style. Here he first came into contact with Hasidism[14] which had a tremendous influence in his life and thought.

Exposed to the cultural setting of the West in his early youth in Lemberg, he absorbed and synthesized this West European Enlightenment with the Hasidic religiosity of the East. Amidst the pious Jewish world of his grandfather's circle, he was gradually initiated into its mystical piety and lore. He acquired an extensive knowledge of the Hebrew language, religion, traditions and folkways. It was with these humble, simple friends of God that Buber learned the language of faith, and he has experienced a deep sympathetic understanding of genuine community. He felt the joyous peace of a life lived and spent in the service of God. Hasidism[15] taught him that men could best worship God through joy, exaltation of spirit and loving service with other men in the world.

---

[13] Ibid., "The Introduction," pp. 11-58.

[14] This word is variously spelled: Hasidism, Chasidism, Chassidism. According to Pfeutze, the use of "ch" and the double s best preserves the Hebrew pronounciation. The term is derived from the name of the "chassidism" who were opponents of the Hellenizers in pre-Maccabean Palestine. See Appendix for a more elaborate description of Hasidism.

Buber studied at the universities of Vienna, Berlin, Leipzig, and Zurich, from where he got his rich background in philosophy, art and literature. While studying the great philosophers of the Greek and Western world, he had both Wilhelm Dilthey and Georg Simmel as teachers. Among his professors, these two people had the strongest lasting influence on young Buber.[16] Of course he knew Sigmund Freud, and he attended lectures of men like Wilhelm Wundt, Mach, and Stumpf. He was an enthusiastic student in psychiatric clinics.

Having studied the great philosophers of the Greek and Western world, Buber was to a certain extent a man of his times. His thoughts have great affinities with many of the motives and themes of Existenzphilosophie, and was definitely influenced by Kierkegaard, Nietzsche[17] and the romantic poets of the period. Buber's writings show numerous illustrations and examples from the arts. As a young man, he has written essays on drama, literature and painting. Yet Buber never identified himself as a slavish follower of any leaders of this current philosophical fashion and has remained all the while independent of any of the schools.

---

[15] The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. VI, p. 257.

[16] "He was influenced to develop the absorption with concrete social and cultural concerns that is so characteristic of his thought by the example of his teachers--Georg Simmel (1858-1918), whose philosophy was sociologically oriented and Wilhelm Dilthey (1830-1911), who spent a lifetime creating a philosophy of culture." Diamond, Malcolm, Martin Buber, The Jewish Existentialist (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), p. 7.

While still a student, Buber joined the emerging Zionist movement under the leadership of Theodor Herzl and Acha Ha'am. In 1899, he married Paula Winkler, who is a well-known fiction writer under the pseudonym of George Mundt.[18] In 1901 he became editor of the Zionist periodical Die Welt. Later he broke with the purely political Zionism of Herzl and the moralism of Achad Ha'am, for Buber's Zionism was basically different. His Zionism was cultural and spiritual, involving primarily an effort to encourage a renascence of authentic Jewish life. Like a modern Asian nationalist, he used all things Jewish. He founded Der Jude, which served as the protagonist of this concept of Zionism. From 1916-1924 he edited Der Jude, and it became the leading organ of the German-speaking Jewry. From 1926-30 he, together with catholic theologian Joseph Wittig, and the Protestant physician and psychotherapist Viktor von Weizsacker, publishəd the journal Die Kreatur. This journal was devoted to social and educational problems in relation to religion.

---

[17] Speaking of this Nietzchean touch on his life and writing, Diamond writes: "Nietzsche influenced Buber's style both directly, through the example of works such as his Thus Spake Zarathustra, and indirectly, through his influence on the late romantics with whom Buber had much in common. He shared their tendency to emotive expression and their passionate involvement with art." Diamond, Martin Buber,...., p. 6.

[18] Current Bibliography, June, 1953, 1957.

Enthralled by the mystical teachings of many religious traditions, as a student, Buber wrote his doctoral dissertation on the study of the thought of a number of Christian mystics of the Renaissance and the Reformation. The emphasis upon the rare moments of ecstasy of the mystical teachings appealed to Buber.[19] Yes, at first his thinking was colored with a definite note of mystical[20] cast, and he devoted some of his early writings to the presentation and interpretation of the classics of mysticism, Western and Oriental. Gradually, however, his outlook changed, and the process of change was speeded up by a significant experience which completed the conversion from the mystical ("religious" in Buber's term) to the "everyday", "here and now", that is where man is now at the present moment.

---

[19] "Ecstatic experiences pointed the way to the concentration of life energies and through it to the outpouring of creative vitality that he found so appealing a part of Nietzsche's message." Diamond, Martin Buber..., p. 7.

[20] Two different types of mysticism, i.e. classical extreme mysticism which claims to effect a fusion between man and God, and communal mysticism which teaches that the communion of man with God is the essence of religious experience. See Hutchison and Martin, Ways of Faith, pp. 467-68; Pfeutze, Self,..., p. 137.

In Daniel, published in 1913, a distinctly existential view comes to the fore. Men, Buber finds, are capable of twofold relation to their experience and environment, namely, "orientation" and "realization". "'Orientation' is the 'objective' attitude that orders the environment for knowledge and use; 'realization' is the approach that brings out the inner meaning of life intensified perception and existence (what German philosophy was beginning to call Existenz)."[21] In I and Thou, as published in 1923, the existential has already given way to the dialogical approach. And this approach governs all his subsequent works.[22] "Basically," Herberg writes, "each of the stages is subsumed in its successors; one aspect of the mystical reappears in the existential, and the existential is fulfilled and deepened in the dialogical."[23]

Soon after the First World War, Buber met Franz

---

[21] Herberg, The Writings of Martin Buber, pp. 12 f. See Buber, Between Man and Man, pp. 13-14 for his own account.

[22] The first draft of I and Thou was, according to Buber, made in 1916, though he did not, he says, attain "steady clarity" until 1919. This classic I and Thou, translated by R. C. Smith first appeared in German in 1923, in English in 1937. See I and Thou, postscript.

[23] Herberg, The Writings..., pp. 13, 335.

Rosenzweig. Together they worked on a fruitful series of literary and educational endeavors and writings which had great imprint on a generation of German Jews. The Buber-Rosenzweig translation of the Hebrew Bible was the most outstanding and important achievement of these joint enterprizes. Another was the Freies Judisches Lehrhaus (Jewish Academy) in Frankfurt, which was an institution with an enduring intellectual influence. Buber remained as professor of the Univesity of Frankfurt for some years after 1923. Upon the Nazis' victory he directed the educational activities and programs of the pressured Jewish community, and helped greatly in the building up of its inner strength and spiritual aids and resources.

In 1938, Buber, now 60 years old, left for Palestine where he accepted the position of professor of social philosophy at Hebrew University. His life was spent in extensive lectures throughout Western Europe until he retired from his professorship from the Hebrew University.

At least twice, Buber visited the United States where he lectured at many universities and seminaries. Through the eyes of one who was privileged to meet Buber personally, let me capture the impact of Buber's visit to the United States by quoting Diamond:

> Until the spring of 1958 I knew Martin Buber only as an intellectual figure. I had been deeply stirred by his outlook but the impact lacked the peculiar warmth that direct contact may engender.

> The three months he spent at Princeton University were a revelation. Not only did he live up to the image that he projects in his work, but his unfailing humor and his fresh approach to all experience surpassed all possible anticipation. He was curious about every detail of American culture from the complexities of its religious manifestations to the working of its supermarkets.[24]

Adult education has always been one of his abiding interests and concerns. In 1949 he founded the Institute of Adult Studies at the Hebrew University. The purpose of this was to train teachers who would work in the immigration camps, and help integrate and adjust a great number of those newcomers in the life of the community. Buber directed this Institute until 1953.

Martin Buber, whose death was in June, 1965, is one of this century's most important representatives of the human spirit. We are now ready to discuss his ideas on selfhood.

SECTION 1

BEGINNING WITH ONESELF

> Only the man who realizes in his whole life with his whole being the relation possible to him helps us to know man truly.[25]

---

[24] Diamond, Martin Buber,..., p. ix. See appendix for a discussion on Hasidism for which Buber is famous.

[25] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 199.

Buber's concept of the man is summarized in this short sentence. Man's faculties, physical, mental, social and spiritual, are one, that is to say, his body cannot be identified with evil and his mind with good. His thoughts cannot be different from his feelings, for his body and mind are of "one being and one substance." All that he does and thinks in one place and at another place must be incorporated in his whole life. His emotions and thoughts, aspirations and actions, his life at home and in the church, in the university and in other public places, must be considered to really know man.

Buber explains this point clearly when he relates the discussion of some rabbi on the value of a good management of an efficient and honest servant and the role of a wife. Rabbi Yitzhak who had difficulties with his wife asked his teacher, Rabbi David of Lelov whether he should oppose his wife. All that Rabbi said was: "Why do you speak to me. Speak to yourself."[26] I understood Rabbi David's reply, Buber writes, when I recalled a certain saying of Baal Shem Tov: "there is thought, speech, and action. Thought corresponds to one's wife, speech to one's children, and action to ane's servant. Whoever straightens himself out in regard to all three will find that everything prospers at his hands."[27]

---

[26] Buber, The Way of Man, p. 26.

[27] Ibid.

Buber insists that if the examination and description of man's nature is to take place, it must be conducted upon man in his entirety. His place and spheres, his responsibilities and relations, his attitudes and characteristics must be known, for to Buber, man is a single man, an indivisible entity. To speak of man is to speak of him as a total creature labeled man, with his assets and liabilities, his capacities and inabilities, his limitations and potentialities, his freedom and responsibilities, his dependence on and independence from others. All these must be regarded as essential to man's nature. It is not the dominance of any one faculty; Buber argues, rather it is the unity of all man's faculties and potentialities within the personality that constitutes the wholeness of man. And it is this that Buber calls "Spirit".

> Spirit is not a late bloom on the tree man, but what constitutes man.... Spirit ... is man's totality that has become consciousness, the totality which comprises and integrates all his capacities, power, qualities, and urges. Spiritual life is nothing but the existence of man, in so far as he possesses that true human conscious totality.[28]

The whole man is unique and "particular". He is born into this world to do something new, something that never existed before, something that only he can create. "Every person born in this world represents something new ... 'It is the duty of every person in Israel to know and consider that he is unique in the world in his particular character and that there has never been anyone like him in the world. Every single man is a new thing in the world and is called upon to fulfill his particularity in this world."[29] It is the obligation of every man to know, discover, and consider that every man is unique in his own particular character, and that there is no one like him. He is here in this world to be himself. Not an object of examination and testing, he is called upon to "straighten himself". He is a single man who must fulfill his particularity. His task is to actualize his unique, unprecedented, and never-before-occurring potentialities. He has to use all that he has and do all that he can to contribute something new and original. It may be the simplest work that he can do, but as long as he uses his God-given abilities to create something new, the same is acceptable. He does not have to imitate what others have done, though what they have achieved may be the greatest.

---

[28] Buber uses the term 'spirit' vaguely and in different fashions to mean different things such as self, soul, personality, reality perceived under the aspect of value of human creativity as well as the divinely working variable. Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 193.

Buber succinctly explains this idea -- the uniqueness of every man -- when he quotes Rabbi Zusya who shortly before his death said: "In the world to come I shall not be asked: 'Why were you not Moses?' I shall be asked: 'Why were you not Zusya?'"[30] Men are, Buber holds, confronted with the fact that they are essentially different from each other. Each has a different set of qualities and inclinations, emotions and thoughts. Each has a way of thinking, a way of doing things, which makes him different from all his neighbors. Even in his relation to God, each man is unique. Buber writes:

---

[29] Buber, Hasidism and Modern Man, p. 137 f.

> All men have access to God, but each man has a different access. Mankind's great chance lies precisely in the unlikeness of men, in the unlikeness of their qualities and inclinations. God's all inclusiveness manifests itself in the infinite multiciplicity of the ways that lead to Him, each of which is open to one man. Each man starting from his particular place and in a manner determined by his particular nature, is able to reach God.[31]

Thus, the way by which man can reach God is revealed to him only when he discovers and considers his own being, his potentialities and his own qualities. He has something priceless and precious that he alone has. And this precious thing in him is known to him only if he truly sees and realizes his strongest feeling, which stirs his inmost being. Buber believes that man's central wish or feeling is simplified in the particular passion which he calls an "Evil Urge". This "Evil Urge" may seek to lead man away from doing what he is intended to do, so Buber advises that the power of this feeling must be used; it must be "diverted from the casual to the essential, from the relative to the absolute."[32]

---

[30] Buber, The Way of Man, p. 18.

[31] Ibid., p. 17.

These potentialities which make man unique are confined within narrow limits, but these limits are not essential. They are only factual. "...man's action is unforeseeable in the cosmos in everything else, he remains the centre of all surprise in the world. But he is fettered surprise, only inwardly is it without bonds; and his fetters are strong."[33]

Man is neither good, Buber believes, nor is he evil. He is a creature who is both "good and evil". While in the garden Adam had the knowledge of good and evil because he was told of the fruit of the tree. His limitation lies in the fact that he must not eat the fruit. Enticed by the serpent, which promised that by eating the fruit man would be God, he was tempted and actually ate it. He found himself naked. What he was told about the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and what he learned after eating the fruit is good and evil altogether. But the act of man in order to be god does not destroy the creation of God. This man's act of asserting himself as god does not make God less than Himself, the Creator. Thus good and evil cannot be poles which are oppesites from each other like left and right or backward and forward. They are not pairs of opposites like here and there, above and beneath. "'God' is the movement in the direction of home," explains Buber, and 'evil' is the aimless whirl of human potentialities without which nothing can be achieved and by which, if they take no direction but remains trapped in themselves, everything goes awry."[34] Knowing this nature as "good and evil together," man goes on to realize the concrete, existential characteristics of his life. The potentialities of man, which no other living creature has, entitle him a social place in this world. Through his participation in the world and his relationship with people he finds his place. And this man's problem of finding meaning in the "wear and tear of life," in the fellowship of people, in the confrontation of God and others who are like himself, shows Buber's picture of the "man of the narrow ridge."

---

[32] Buber, Between Man and Man, pp. 123-26.

[33] Ibid., p. 78.

"I have occasionally described my standpoint to my friends as the 'Narrow Ridge'", writes Buber.[35] He believes that only through this approach can we avoid the abyss of abstract unity on the one hand and that of empty, meaningless relativity of the other. This approach is what he calls a genuine third alternative to modern individualism and modern collectivism. He goes on to say that individualism conceives

---

[34] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 78.

[35] Ibid., p. 184.

of man in his partiality (that is a segment of man), whereas collectivism can see man only as a part (that is, of a greater society). Neither encompasses the whole man. Now, Buber argues, the man of the 'narrow ridge' is one who meets another person with his whole life. He meets him here and now where he is. He turns to him as a Thou, a whole man.

Of equal importance to Buber, who believes that man is a whole human person, is the fact that man must be considered as an end in himself and never a means. Certain views of man such as the historical, scientific, and social, seem to place man in a position where he is not supposed to be. He is placed in a situatimn where his potentialities are not fully developed. He is located in a station so different and subordinate to the framework in which he functions. Sometimes he is considered as the thing among things of the world. At other times man is just a fixed and specific dividing line between the spiritual and physical nature; and still at other times, he is utterly alone by the awareness of his unworthiness, his 'infinite smallness' in relation to an infinitely large and incomprehensible universe. Some men think of man as a principle in which universal reason achieves self-consciousness, while others think of man purely as a product of society. In such cases when man's nature is seen as an objective problem in which the concrete rational man fails to recognize that he is not only the object but also the subject of thought and relationship, his role is reduced only as an instrument, and thus his essential characteristics as a whole man are disregarded. In doing so, the true picture of man is distorted; his essence which is found in his meeting with others is denied; thus the meaning of a unique and individual man, as a single, total, vital unit is sacrificed for the end to which he becomes only a means, a tool and an object.

Buber, on the other hand, is aware of the fact that man exists within society which is composed of thinking men who set up the rational organization. He also knows that the individual human being who is in society is solitary. Man is influenced by society and by the people he lives with. It does not necessarily follow, however, that man is so conditioned by society that he cannot think no longer for himself. Buber's man is one who can meet and work with others in a group without losing his responsibilities; and that notwithstanding the solitude and loneliness to which he is exposed, he has the power to overcome the same. Man, who has the capacities to be the creator of social structure, is, therefore, the end to which society or any other man-made formulation addresses itself. Man is a whole human being. He is not a centaur. He has both rational powers, spiritual acumen and intuitive abilities. He has capacities for fellowship and group participation. He faces with his whole being the responsibilities entrusted to him, and he has the qualities and powers to grasp what he himself is and to overcome the tension of solitude.

> Man is not a centaur, he is man through and through. He can be understood only when one knows, on the one hand, that there is something in all that is human, including thought, which belongs to the general nature of living creatures, and is to be grasped from this nature, while knowing on the other hand, that there is no quality which belongs fully to the general nature of living creatures, and is to be grasped exclusively from it. Even man's hunger is not an animal's hunger. Human reason is to be understood only in connection with human non-reason.[36]

Thus, if man is to be viewed in his entirety, his true form, he must be elevated to his proper position as a creature of uniqueness, of unity, of purpose and relations. We are now ready to discuss what and how he realizes his uniqueness and develops his potentialities in human relationships.

SECTION II

THE I-THOU AND I-IT RELATIONS[37]

There are two types of environment, namely, the human and the physical. Correspondingly, there are two attitudes[38] with which man may face the world, the personal and the functional. The intellectual faculty of man is both intuitive and rational, personal and functional. Therefore, man's relationships to environment are classified into two classes; first the personal answer or response which is given mostly to his fellowmen; and secondly, the objective mechanical adjustments which are mostly made toward the things and objects about him. The former is the attitude in which I take my stand and "actualize" the presence of the other person in a mutual relation between persons -- I enter into relation with a person and not with a thing. The latter is the attitude in which the object of my attention is a thing which I can use, appropriate or control. The thing is something that serves my purpose, my position and advantage. There is, Buber asserts, a great difference between one's attitude and response to other persons and one's attitude to objects and things. The first one is a personal relation of a subject to another subject; a relation of person to person. The other is a mere connection with things or objects, a relation of a person with experienced or used objects. Buber designates the first one as the I-Thou relationship and the second as I-It relationship. These, the combined words, I-Thou and I-It,[39] are the two primary words which man is capable of speaking.

---

[36] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 160.

[37] Arthur Schilpp and M. Friedman, eds., The Philosophy of Martin Buber (La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 1967), p. 705.

[38] Buber, I and Thou, pp. 3, 6, 31.

Thus, there are two basic orders of living since the primary words intimate relation.[40] These two basic situations are the world of Thou, where there is a dialogic relation, a personal I-Thou relation; and the world of It, where there is impersonal connection. In the world of Thou, the person meets another person, he faces and engages him with his whole being.[41] In the world of It, the person experiences, judges, uses, arranges and controls an object. The person does not give all his whole life when he appropriates and utilizes things. In the world of Thou, the relation itself is primary and underived; in the world of It, the relation is only secondary. "As experience, the world belongs to the primary word I-It. The primary word I-Thou establishes the world of relation."[42]

---

[39] Buber, I and Thou, p. 3.

[40] Idem.

What exactly is the nature of this I-Thou relation? How does it differ from that of the I-It experience? Buber says that the I-Thou encounter cannot be explained; it can only be indicated. Jacob Agus, who is known to have the first significant study of Buber to appear in English, showed this point quite clearly when he said that, if we are to grasp the meaning of the I-Thou relation and its uniqueness, we must listen to Buber's appeal to find an echo of his suggestions in our life.[43] But it was Malcom Diamond,[44] who in his book captured quite lucidly in his own life and personal experiences the meaning of I-Thou relation as he related his own telling, personal experiences. Let me in my own way explain this I-Thou relation the way I read Buber's I and Thou, hoping that in my own life I may be able to hear an echo of Buber's words.

---

[41] *Idem*.

[42] *Idem*.

[43] Jacob B. Agus, *Modern Philosophies of Judaism* (New York: Behrman's Jewish Book, 1941), pp. 239 ff.

[44] *Martin Buber: The Jewish Existentialist*, pp. 24 ff. I personally believe that among Buber's commentators and

The primary word I-Thou is the world of relation. It is a relation of person to person, of subject to another subject, a relation of reciprocity, of directness and of presentness involving "meeting" or "encounter". There is no thing or object involved here, but a Thou.

"If I face a human being as my Thou, and say the primary I-Thou (speech) to him, he is not a thing among things, and does not consist of things."[45] The Thou in this I-Thou relation is no object. It is not something that I can observe or look at, neither is it a tool which I can use for my own needs and demands. It is not a thing to be perceived and experienced, a nature to be studied and described, or a specific point of space and time. It is not an instrument that I can use in my daily work as a student; it cannot be a book to be read. Rather, this human being "who is not He or She, bounded from every other He and

---

writers, Diamond has enlightened me most in his treatment of Buber's concept and in his attempt to find an echo of Buber's insights in his life's experiences.

[45] Buber, I and Thou, p. 8.

She"[46] is a whole being in himself. He is my Thou to whom I can go out in fellowship. "But with no neighbor, and whole in himself, he is Thou and fills the heavens. This does not mean that nothing exists except himself. But all else lives in his life."[47]

"Thou has no bounds;"[48] the Thou cannot be appropriated, but I am brought up short against it. The characteristic situation here is one of meeting: I meet the other, the Thou. When I meet the Thou, I must give all that is in my life. The whole of my being is involved here and I am conscious of meeting the Other in his unique totality. I am present with my whole being. All partial actions are suspended, the whole being becomes a unity as I go out to the meeting. No abstractions, no diversions, no irrelevancies should exist.

"The Thou meets me through grace."[49] I cannot seek for him. I can only meet him. I who know the Thou must go out to meet the Thou and step into direct relatimn with it, and the Thou responds to the meeting. I can only enter into the relation, with my whole being; yet it is through the relation, through the speaking of Thou, that concentration and fusion into the whole being takes place. "As I become I, I say Thou."[50]

---

[46] Buber, I and Thou, p. 8.

[47] Ibid., pp. 8, 9.

[48] Ibid., p. 4.

[49] Ibid., p. 11.

The I-Thou relation is "direct". The Thou is not a means but an end in itself. No meditation of sense, idea, plan or fancy is necessary in the meeting between the I and Thou. Every means is a barrier and anything indirect is irrelevant and immaterial. To illustrate this point, Buber explains: "If I am considering a tree, for instance, and my will andgrace become Bound up in relation to it, the tree is no longer an object, not an It but a Thou. Everything about the tree -- the view and movement, the sway of its leaves, its color, trunk, structure and form; and everything that a tree is made up, is immediately present and united in a single whole, a total unity. The tree is no impression, no play of my imagination, no value depending on my mood, but it is bodied over against me and has to do with me, as I with it, only in a different way."[51] Buber is pushing the "idea" of stubborn realism, the concrete, the "tangible".[52] To him the tree is something concrete and real. The tree is a Thou to him. He regards the tree concretely as a living and beautiful whole, a unique totality. There is no rigid boundary between experience and non-experience, between what is given and what is not given, between the ideal form and real appearance.[53] The real boundary cuts across these borders and lies between Thou and It. The real, the concrete is apprehended as personal, as a Thou.

---

[50] Buber, I and Thou, p. 11.

[51] Ibid., p. 8.

[52] Ibid., pp. 7-8.

The I-Thou world transcends mathematical time, for the present of the I-Thou relation is not the time which indicates that something happened or will happen. It is not the time which we think of when we talk of the past and future tense, the yesterday and the tomorrow. Rather, it is the "real, filled present." It is like the "eternal now" of the mystic, which is the present of intensity and wholeness. There is no duration here, for the present is continuous and enduring. It does not exist within the soul of man, nor does it reside in man at all. It exists only insofar as meeting and relation exist. It exists only when the I, a whole person, who is conscious of the Thou as a unique totality, and Thou actually meet.

Similarly, this I-Thou relation is not set in the context of space. In this relation, both space and time fade in the background, for they do not have a place in this dialogic relation. I do not meet my Thou in some time and place, I do not say, "I will meet you tomorrow at the university library" to my Thou. Of course, I can say the same (the sentence) but each time I do, I transform our person-to-person relation to an understood and planned connection. I do harm and violence to the truth of the meeting with the Thou. The context of the I-Thou relation is the center, where real meeting is consummated -- in the eternal Thou. "The world of It is set in the context of space and time. The world of Thou is not set in the context of either of these. Its context is in the Centre, where the extended lines of relation meet -- in the eternal Thou."[54]

---

[53] Buber, _I and Thou_, p. 12.

In the world of Thou, man is exempt from the reign of causality, for causality is a handmaiden of the ordered world of continuity and takes its meaning from it. He does not know fate, or even if he knows fate, he does not believe in the same. He knows only freedom, struggle, direction, decision and responsibility. "So long as the heaven of Thou is spread out over me the winds of causality cower at my heels, and the whirlpool of fate stays its course."[55] He lives in a world of relation where persons meet as I and Thou; and where mutual fellowship exists.

Love is the characteristic of an I-Thou relation. Love here is not the eros, the emotional or subjective feeling. Feelings are present in love, but feelings do not constitute love. "Feelings dwell in man; but man dwells in his love.[56] Love is similar to the New Testament or the

---

[54] Buber, I and Thou, pp. 100, 75, 115.

[55] Ibid., p. 9.

[56] Ibid., p. 14.

Greek word, agape. "Love is the responsibility of an I for a Thou."[57] The person who loves knows no barriers, like the color of the other's skin, or his nationality. He loves people whether they are strong or weak, intelligent or dull, poor or rich. He sees a person as a whole being; and he confronts him in his uniqueness and preciousness as a Thou. So that he who hates, that is the person who sees only a part of a person, is not in an I-Thou relation. "Yet the man who straightforwardly hates is nearer to relation than the man without hate or love."[58] The man who genuinely hates another is nearer to an I-Thou relation than the man who is indifferent or exploitive. "Such a man really has in mind the person whom he hates as distinct from the man whose hatred and love does not mean its objective but is void of real intention."[59]

"This is important because contemporary life encourages the indifference that precludes, as hate does not, all possibility of recognizing the other as a man like oneself," writes Diamond. "A man expressing irritation with an elevator operator must turn toward him. He may then recognize this humanity. The man who enters the cubicle and does nothing but mutter a number with the same indifference with which he would press a button in an automatic elevator, can come to no such realization,"[60] he further explains.

---

[57] Buber, I and Thou, p. 15.

[58] Ibid., p. 16.

[59] Friedman, Martin Buber,..., p. 59.

There is reciprocity in this dialogic relation. There is genuine response and responsibility. Persons in this relation have mutual obligations and mutual promise. Each person is a faithful and trustworthy being who is in fellowship with another chained by the ties of covenant, one who exchanges vows of loyalty. He makes claims upon the other and at the same time he puts himself under obligation. He is free and yet bound. He can choose to sever the ties and yet he remains in the fellowship of binding and loyal bonds. And even if he rejects, he is still conditioned by it. Two persons live together, checking and limiting each other. Each is an independent person from another, really different from the other though they are together. Their relation is mutual.

The man of the I-Thou relation is aware of others. He knows that there are other people like him. He meets them as persons, his neighbors, his friends. He is also conscious of the Person who created others and him. He stands before his neighbors and in the presence of God. He turns to the finite persons and to the infinite Person. There are not two relationships but a dual relationship. "Every particular Thou is a glimpse through to the eternal Thou; by means of every particular Thou the primary word addresses the eternal Thou."[61]

---

[60] Diamond, Martin Buber,..., p. 28.

In every true meeting with the Thou, we come to know the ultimate reality and meaning of life. In each Thou we catch a breath from the eternal Thou; in each Thou we address the eternal Thou."[62] These moments of meeting the Thou are glorious, divine and immortal; they are moments of revelation. Of course revelation has no precise, specific content. It brings no definite instruction and command, but it brings assurance as to the meaningfulness of life.[63]

At this instance, let us give Buber's example of the I-Thou relation. Man and woman are the example of this basic relation which embodies the I-Thou relation. There is, Buber asserts, an exemplary bond, two people revealing the Thou to each other. "Marriage is the exemplary bond; it carries us as does none other into the greater bondage, and only as those who are bound can we reach the freedom of the children of God." Buber continues, "This person is other, essentially other than myself, and this otherness of his is what I mean, because I wish his particular being to exist."[64] The recognition and confirmation of the other in his or her uniqueness are present in Love. There is no place for control over one or the other. And there is an I-Thou relation, "a meeting of equals, in which there occurs a multiplication of interests and values and a division of responsibility, each for the other and to the other."[65] Indeed, "the heart of marriage," as Diamond explains, "as of love, is in responding to the other within a framework created by the relationship itself."[66]

---

[61] Buber, I and Thou, p. 75.

[62] Ibid., pp. 66, 75, 109, 115.

[63] Ibid., pp. 110 ff.

[64] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 61.

The I of the primary word I-Thou is a person. "The I of the primary word I-Thou makes its appearance as a person and becomes conscious of itself as subjectivity (without a dependent genitive)."[67] The person makes his appearance by virtue of his relation with other persons. The person is concerned with reality, with the true self, with the full I. Through the relation, the person shares in a reality which cannot be appropriated and manipulated but only shared. The more direct his contact with the Thou, the fuller his sharing; the fuller his sharing, the more real his I.[68]

Reading Buber's writing, one would easily conclude that Buber's man is one who has only the I-Thou relation. This is not so, because Buber's man has both the I-Thou and I-It relations. While it is true that Buber believes that the I-Thou relation is the relation par excellence, still he believes that man must have both the I-Thou and I-It relations. Man must live in the twofold dimension, Buber holds. And when Buber speaks of man living in twofold dimensions, he does not speak of two kinds of man. Rather, he refers to the two poles of humanity, two dimensions within which the same man may dwell, the two attitudes (I-Thou and I-It) with which man may face his environment.[69] Thus, Buber's man or man of the 'Narrow Ridge' is one who has both relations, and he is one who carries with him the spark or breath of the world of Thou whenever he returns to the world of It.[70]

---

[65] Pfeutze, Self, Society, Existence, p. 163.

[66] Diamond, Martin Buber,..., p. 28.

[67] Buber, I and Thou, p. 62.

[68] Ibid., pp. 62 ff.

Buber goes on to explain that there are some men who are so defined by I-It attitude that they may be called "Individuals." These "individuals" know no reality because they know no meaning in mutual sharing. The more they are mastered by the I-It attitude, the more they find themselves sinking into unreality, discord and death. Buber seems to think that most men nowadays are living in the world of It. Hence he strongly advocates the reality of the I-Thou relation. Buber explains in his article, "Elements of the Interhuman" that the "person" is the "being man", while the "individual" who is so defined by the I-It attitude is "a seeming man".[71]

---

[69] Buber, I and Thou, p. 65.

[70] Friedman, Martin Buber,..., pp. 57-61; 77-84. Buber, I and Thou, pp. 62-63.

[71] Buber, The Knowledge of Man, pp. 72, 88.

The Thou of this I-Thou relation can be a thing, person or spiritual being, as we will discuss fully in the next section on Threefold Living Relation. But let us first be very clear in saying or indicating that the Thou is spoken only in meeting, in a person-to-person relation. The Thou is not a state which can be frozen and preserved, not a thing which can be possessed and thrown away. The Thou is not a synonym for love, that feeling between the Romeo and his Juliet, not the enjoyment of a wonderful emotion, not even the ecstacy of a Tristan and Isolde, for the Thou is not a grammatical device for expressing love (though it is true that the Thou cannot be spoken where there is no love). The Thou is not spoken word (the way we utter and exchange words in an ordinary conversation), for although the Thou is spoken it may not be spoken without a sound.[72] But if the Thou is spoken only with the sound (that is, the way we say a word, and the whole being of the speaker is not involved), there is no Thou either. The Thou can be spoken only when man addresses anything[73] with his whole being. The Thou is spoken out over being and, as such, the Thou serves to draw being together. It arises only in relation, a situation when man in his unique totality turns to another person who is himself a total indivisible vital unit. The moment only a part of the person is present, that is, when man turns to another with only a part of his being, the relation is no longer an I-Thou relation. The relation is now a relation of a person to a thing, a relation of a subject to an object. The Thou becomes an It, a thing among things, tools among tools. Buber writes:

---

[72] For fuller discussion distinguishing between genuine and pseudo relations, see Buber, Between Man and Man, pp. 19 ff.

[73] Buber, I and Thou, p. 3.

> But this is the exalted melancholy of our fate, that every Thou in our world must become an It. It does not matter how exclusively present the Thou was in the direct relation. As soon as the relation has been worked out or has been permeated with a means, the Thou becomes an object among objects -- perhaps the chief, but still one of them, fixed in its size and its limits.[74]

The two relations, I-Thou and I-It, together build human existence. They have their places and purposes in the life of a person. Although Buber believes that the I-Thou relation is the relation par excellence, yet to Buber I-It relation has its place and purpose.[75] Thus Buber reminds us: "And in all the seriousness of truth, hear this: without It man cannot live."[76] It is a question of which of the two is at any time the architect and which is its assistant. It is a question of whether the I-Thou relation remains the architect, for it is self-evident that it cannot be employed as assistant. If it does not command, then it ceases to be itself. Aware of the present situation, Buber seems disturbed. Thus he writes:

---

[74] Buber, I and Thou, p. 16.

[75] Hatt has missed this point altogether when he criticized Buber for the latter's minimization of the significance of I-It. Buber stresses out the importance of the I-It relation in the scheme of things and in human relations. Also Buber's "inborn Thou" does not eliminate the significance of impersonal elements for fostering personal relationships. Buber endorses what Daniel Williams in his book God's Grace and Man's Hope, pp. 97, 36, said when he cites as example the impersonal factors in laws, in institutions, and in rational ethical principles, and insists that they enter into and support the growth of the personal factors. He insists that "factors of consciousness and mentality, and

> In our age the I-It relation, gigantically swollen, has usurped, practically uncontested, the master and the rule. The I of this relation, an I that possesses all, makes all, succeeds with all, this I that is unable to say Thou, unable to meet a being essentially, is the Lord of the hour. This selfhood that has become omnipotent, with all the It around it, can naturally acknowledge neither God nor any genuine absolute which manifests itself to men as of non-human origin.[77]

Of course, the I-It relation is not evil. Man cannot live without it. "But he who lives with It alone is not a man," thus Buber warns. It is of evil when It is markedly predominant so that the person living in this world of It becomes impersonal in his relation with persons and things; he no

---

moral freedom" do not exhaust the wonder of human personality, for the great wonder is that these factors arise and operate within an impersonal framework. Harold Hatt, Encountering Truth (Nashville: Abingdon Press), pp. 28-29.

[76] Buber, I and Thou, p. 34.

[77] Buber, Eclipse of God, p. 129.

longer knows the personal response. He is governed by mechanical manipulative adjustments so much that persons and things are just objects to him.[78]

The man who lives only in this world of It is no man because "Real living is meeting." What then is the nature of the I-It relation?

The Nature of the I-It Relation

In the I-It relation, there is an object, an object to be experienced and used, which is set in the context of time and space.

"The primary word I-It can never be spoken with the whole being."[79] Man faces things with only a part of his being, his senses, or calculating mind. He grasps a thing only in its particular aspects according to his needs and purposes. The thing which is an object of investigation is treated only in its segments, not as a whole, undivided total unit. Buber gives an example in the "consideration of the tree."[80] A person looks at it as a part of the world, a beautiful thing in his garden. He sees the leaves swaying as the wind passes by. He can appreciate the beauty of the color of the leaves, he can behold the view of the tree as it stands. He can touch the trunk and feel its hardness.

---

[78] Buber, I and Thou, p. 46.

[79] Ibid., p. 3.

[80] Ibid., p. 7.

He can study its chemical composition. He can classify and differentiate the tree from other things. Yes, the man in this I-It relation can see only a part of the tree, and not the tree itself, the tree as a single whole.

And because man faces a thing only with a part of his being, there is no response. The It, the thing, does not respond but passively allows itself to be experienced, to be studied, to be considered. No mutuality exists here. Man alone enjoys the thing, and the thing gets nothing. This I-It relation is subjective, purely subjective. It takes place within a man and not between him and the world, not between him and the thing considered.

The world of It is set in the context of space and time.[81] This is the world of security, of predictable events, of written and fixed laws which enable man to form a reasonable plan by which to build, maintain and equip organized social living. There is order in this world of It. A person need not worry, for everything is arranged and planned. There is a system of coordination and order.

In this world of It there is manipulative activity, a mere mechanical connection with things. The man with this activity or connection leaves the "content", the "heart" out of living, and he deals only with the surface and from the surface. The connection does not go deep, it is detached, objectified, impersonal, easily entered and left. Buber opposed this connection and manipulation of things, in addition to sentimental egotism. Sentimental egotism, he says, never gets beyond the private boundaries. The emotional feelings revolved upon themselves and are there in themselves, without ever passing over into the common life. There is no relation but just internalizing, experiencing.

---

[81] Buber, I and Thou, p. 33.

To Buber, the man who lives in this world of It has a life divided into two separate provinces: one of institutions--It, and one of feelings--I.

> Institutions are "outside" where all sorts of aims are pursued, where man works, negotiates, bears influence, undertakes, concurs, organizes, conducts business, officiates, preaches. ... Feelings are "within" where life is lived and recovers from institutions. Here the spectrum of the emotions dances before the interested glance.[82]

Both institutions and feelings know no man or mutual life. Neither institutions nor feelings have access to real life and real meeting. "Institutions know only the specimen, feelings only the object!"[83] "Both are necessary; but put together they do not create human life; this is done by the third, the central presence of the Thou."[84]

---

[82] Buber, I and Thou, p. 43.

[83] Ibid., p. 44.

[84] Ibid., p. 46.

Causality rules as king in this world of It.[85] Material progress, scientific knowledge, human development are all considered as subsumed under the scientific ordering of the world. The object of science is determined by the laws of cause and effect. Science knows no creation, no novelties, no unique creative acts in any level of life. It recognizes only a new classification of old elements; it recognizes only what is dead and gone in the past, and therefore determined and fixed. If a human being becomes an object of scientific study, he is made clearly into a machine, a robot, into a dead thing. There is no life, there is no creative spirit.

"The I of the primary word I-It makes its appearance as individuality and becomes conscious of itself as subjectivity (of experiencing and using)."[86] "Individuality," the I of the I-It, becomes conscious of itself as the subject of experiencing and using. It makes its appearance through being differentiated from other individualities and is conscious of itself as a particular kind of being. This "individual" is concerned only with his my -- my kind, my group, my nation, my creation, my genius, my possession. This "individual" knows no reality, because he does not know how to share with others. Everything is appropriated and utilized by himself. His life is delusion, pseudo-life. In contrast with the I of the I-Thou relation, that is, the person who shares with others, the I of this world of It knows no relation whatsoever. While the I of the I-Thou relation answers "I am," to a question who are you?, the I of this world of It replies "I am such and such."[87]

---

[85] Buber, I and Thou, p. 51.

[86] Ibid., p. 62.

The It of the I-It relation may equally well be a person (he or she), an animal, a tree without any change in the primary word.[88] The It is considered an object, a thing. The It is something that one can use, control, something that one can possess and keep, something that one can make use of. An example may be given. The biologist can look at a human being as an It, an object of his scientific study. Taking a very objective, dispassionate, scientific pose, he may dissect the person, his body; he analyzes it like a student in an anatomy class who examines and studies the human structure. He classifies it according to what species of the animal kingdom it belongs. He may study the parts of a person. He may have an experiment to determine the chemical composition of the body, like calculating the amount of oxygen or hydrogen or carbon dioxide which must be present. Yes, the biologist may study the human person; its physiology, histology, its ecology, etc. But the human being in this case is not a Thou but an It, an object of inquiry and investigation, an instrument of knowledge and instruction, a material for demonstration in his laboratory.

---

[87] Buber, I and Thou, p. 64.

[88] *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 101.

The I-Thou relation is unique; yet this dialogic relation can be found in different spheres of experience. A person may say Thou to other persons, but he may also say the same to a tree, a lake, an animal, a work of art, an idea, forms or God. And any It (man, animal, etc.) may be regarded as a "thou" through the power of imagination, attitude, intention, grace and profound insight -- this point we shall discuss further. Buber, for instance, shares with us some autobiographical facts to illustrate this point.[89]

"How powerful is the unbroken world of It, and how delicate are the appearances of the Thou!"[90] The real determinant of the primary word in which a man takes his stand is not the "what" -- the object which is over against him but the "how" -- in which he relates himself to that object.

In his book, Eclipse of God, Buber clearly sets out the distinction between the two types of relation. He writes:

---

[89] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 23.

[90] Buber, I and Thou, p. 98.

> ... the second (I-It) always brings us only to the aspects of an existing being, not to that being itself. Even the most intimate contact with another remains covered over by an aspect if the other has not become Thou for me. Only the first relation (I-Thou), that which establishes essential immediacy between me and an existing being, brings me just thereby not to an aspect of it but to that being itself. To be sure, it brings me only to the existential me in a position to view it objectively in its being. As soon as an objective viewing is established, we are given only an aspect and ever again only an aspect.[91]

It is obvious that the "I-Thou and I-It cut across the lines of our ordinary distinctions to focus our attention not upon individual objects and their casual connections but upon the relations between things, the dazwiscben ('there in-between')"[92] explains Maurice Friedman.

The fundamental difference between I-Thou and I-It comes to light in the experience of early man and the development of a child.[93] Buber contends that the I-Thou attitude precedes the I-It attitude. In plain language, the Thou-attitude and response is innate and habitual with the primitive man or with the child. Using the development of the child, Buber says that the child must find for himself his own world through seeing, hearing and touching. This world is not ready-made.[94] He does not possess the world.

---

[91] Buber, Eclipse of God, p. 129.

[92] Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 57.

[93] Buber, I and Thou, p. 22.

[94] Ibid., p. 18.

He must win it for himself, draw it out and make it into a reality for himself by hearing, touching and shaping. The world arises to meet his senses, thus revealing the essential nature of creation as form. In this process the effort to establish relation (with a Teddy bear, or toy or anything) comes first and is followed by the actual relation, saying of Thou without words. The behavior of the child to reach out a pet or toy is not an experience of a thing, not yet: it is the instinct to make everything into a Thou, to enter into relation with what is alive and dynamic over against him. And one day, the simmering kettle pot, or the toy, or the Teddy bear become a Thou, that is, he begins to have an I-Thou relation with the Thou without saying words. Hence "in the beginning is relation."[95] "The inborn Thou" becomes realized by the child in personal actualized being, in the lived relations with what meets it.[96] The fact that he can realize what is over against him as Thou is based on the "a priori of relation," that is, the potentiality of relation which exists between him and the world. Through the meeting of the Thou, the child gradually becomes an I. Finally, however, he loses his relation with the Thou, that is, when the pet or teddy bear becomes a separated object, an object of play, of perception and observation. The pet or the teddy bear which was first Thou to the child is now an It, an object among objects. Thus the child who was formerly an I-Thou relation is now in the world of It.[97]

---

[95] Buber, I and Thou, p. 18.

[96] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

Buber's assertion that I-Thou is chronologically prior in development to it is another misunderstanding of Buber's view. "In the beginning is relation." I-Thou is not a specific human achievement but a basic human situation and relation of spontaniety.

There is, however, Buber asserts, one Thou which can never become an It. This Thou is the eternal Thou, or God in whom the extended lines of I-Thou and I-It relations meet.[98] We shall discuss this further in Section V; meanwhile, we shall now proceed to the investigation of the three-fold living relations around which these two I-Thou and I-It relations arise.

SECTION III

THE THREE-FOLD LIVING RELATION

> The spheres in which the world of relation
>   arises are three.
> First, our life with nature. There the relation
>   sways in gloom, beneath the level of
>   speech.
> Creatures live and move over against us,
>   but cannot come to us, and when we
>   address them as

---

[97] Buber, I and Thou, pp. 23-28.

[98] Ibid., p. 75.

> Thou, our words cling to the threshold of
> speech,
> Second, our life with men. There the
> relation is open and in the form of
> speech.
> We can give and accept the Thou.
> Third, our life with spiritual beings.
> There the relation is clouded, yet it
> discloses itself; it does not use
> speech, yet begets it.
> We perceive no Thou, but none the less we
> feel we are addressed and we answer--
> forming, thinking, acting.
> We speak the primary word with our being,
> though we cannot utter Thou with our lips.
> But with what right do we draw what lies
> outside speech into relation with the
> world of the primary word?[99]

Man's total essential nature, Buber asserts, is fulfilled only if he lives with his whole being in all three relations. Man cannot live by himself. All three relations must exist before man's life, his essential nature, becomes full, blessed and whole.[100]

The important thing to Buber is man's capacity to address and be addressed by natural objects, by men and by spiritual beings.[101] This is Buber's profound insight, the corollary of which is that knowledge of oneself is preeminently knowledge of oneself in relation to another.[102]

---

[99] Buber, I and Thou, p. 6.

[100] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 177.

[101] Buber, I and Thou, pp. 6, 101.

[102] More on Address and Response will be discussed in Section IV on Responsibility, see also Pfeutze, Self, Society, and Existence.

The meaning of existence is known to man only when he hears himself addressed, and answers with his whole being out of responsible decision.

A. With Things and World

First, man is related to the world and to things.[103] He may address nature or natural objects as Thou. In a previous discussion,[104] we cited Buber's illustration of an I-Thou relation with the tree. Let us consider another example -- the relation of an artist with the flower. The artist looks at a flower. He regards the flower concretely as a living and beautiful whole; he responds to it as a unique totality; the flower says something to him; it stirs his being, and he answers. He speaks the primary word out of his whole being to the flower which appears as a whole, a total unit. The flower is not merely an it, a thing to be perceived or an object to be studied. The flower becomes a Thou, a Thou to be enjoyed, to be loved; the artist mingles his whole life as it were, with the soul of the flower. This act of meeting between the artist and the flower involves a sacrifice and a risk -- the sacrifice of endless possibility to the exclusiveness of that particular relation; the risk of giving himself wholly and wholeheartedly to the flower which faces or confronts him. The flower is a Thou to the artist who beholds it with the wholeness of his being and in the wholeness of its form. The relation of the artist and the flower in this particular case is an I-Thou relation.

---

[103] Buber, I and Thou, p. 6.

[104] Section II, of the same chapter.

In the same vein, Buber gives us a particular example -- his experience with the tree. The tree as an object of perception is an It. But It (tree) can be a Thou when "I have both will and grace, that in considering the tree I become bound up in relation to it. The tree is now no longer It. I have been seized by the power of exclusiveness."[105] As Buber summarizes:

> Everything belonging to the tree is in this: its structure, its colours and chemical composition, its intercourse with the elements and with the stars, all present in a single whole. The tree is no impression, no play of my imagination, no value depending on my mood; but it is bodied over against me and has to do with me, as I with it -- only in a different way.[106]

Indeed man can have not only the I-It relation with a thing or object, but he can also have an I-Thou relation with the same object. But this relation is conducted only at the threshold of speech. No words can be spoken by natural objects, for they have no power to communicate through the gesture of speech, the spoken word.

Buber is quick to explain further that this relation with the tree as a Thou is mutual, and "let no attempt be made to sap the strength from the meaning of the relation." Anticipating some inquirers' doubts on the question of the similarity of human consciousness with that of the tree, Buber states: "of that I have no experience. But do you wish, through seeming to succeed in it with yourself, once again to disintegrate that which cannot be disintegrated. I encounter no soul or dryad of the tree, but the tree itself."[107]

---

[105] Buber, I and Thou, p. 7.

[106] Ibid., pp. 7-8.

B. With Men

Man may address another man as Thou. We have already seen the reality of this relation of man with another human being who is himself a Thou to turn to (see Section II, p.33). Man becomes aware[108] of the "other", the Thou, and he affirms the existence of the latter in an I-Thou relation. And this relation between man and man, between I and Thou, is naturally open, clear and in the form of speech.[109]

Man is primarily a person in a world of I-Thou relations. Within this personal relationship, and distinctively essential to it, is the factor of speech. Quoist shows the role of speech when he writes: "Speech is God's gift. We shall have to account for it. It is through words that we communicate with each other and that we reveal what we are. We haven't the right to be silent, but speaking is a serious matter, and we must weigh our words in the sight of God."[110] Speech poses at the heart of this constitutive relationship the attribute of claim, and mutual awareness and acceptance of claims which human beings as persons have upon one another. This, of course, includes the divine claim which the Eternal Thou, God, makes upon all men. Of course there are other forms of mediums of human communication like art, drama, ritual or even silence which convey truth, message and value judgments. One need not read all of Buber's books to know that to Buber, speech is not just the everyday affairs of words, which may or may not be communication. The whole man's hallowing of life and his relation is speech itself; his very life itself may speak. Buber even goes further to assert that God's act of creation is speech.[111]

---

[107] Buber, I and Thou, p. 8.

[108] Buber, Between Man and Man, pp. 8-9.

[109] Buber, I and Thou, p. 6.

Yet, daily speech with words remains superior to all other means of communication and therefore indispensable in the world of personal relations. Speech, the personal address, is the par excellence mode or agency of this claim of man to another, because in this relationshp speech involves a responsible answer from another, a reply which cannot be predicted or planned.

---

[110] Michel Quoist, Prayers (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963), p. 69.

[111] Buber, Israel and the World, p. 27; also Pfeutze, Self, Society and Existence, pp. 257-60. Buber, I and Thou, p. 103.

Man can use the "power of speech," that is, the command of words. There is sound, and there is gesture. A student can understand what a professor is lecturing because the latter is using words. The former's auditory nerves function while the professor with the aid of his vocal cords and linguistic knowledge endeavors to explain the lecture of the day. There is a question and answer discourse. There is a reasoning together, creating a community of insights, ideas, and understanding. Vocal symbols, that is, language, are so important. Truly without speech and hearing a person is cut off from the world of relationships. "The spoken word is right within the core of the I-Thou relationship and the written or printed word is always a poor substitute for it."[112] And it is for the same reason that the mimeographed or printed letter, in comparison with the hand-written one, appears vaguely impersonal. H. H. Farmer states it more forcefully when he writes:

> The reason why the spoken word is thus at the very heart of the world of persons in relationship of the I-Thou relationship, is that it is supremely that medium of communication wherein the three

---

[112] Herbert Farmer, The Servant of the Word, p. 41.

> elements ... will and claim and shared meanings, are, or can be, at a maximum together in a single, fused unity.[113]

The relation becomes more clear and natural with the use of words in an I-Thou relationship. There is giving and taking, sharing and receiving, talking and listening, addressing and responding. There is the threshold of mutuality. "We can give and accept the Thou."[114] The value of speech depends upon genuine I-Thou relation, Buber warns, it does not depend upon agreement or simple understanding. On the contrary, as Buber explains in "The word that is Spoken", misunderstanding is itself fruitful and effective as the basis upon whichever new genuinely two-sided understanding may take place. Buber notes:

> In our age, in which the true meaning of every word is encompassed by delusion and falsehood and the original intention of the human glance is stifled by tenacious mistrust, it is of decisive importance to find again the genuineness of speech and existence as We. ... Man will not persist in existence if he does not learn anew to persist in it as a genuine We.[115]

The I-Thou relation is not only between one person and another, as some critics of Buber seem to believe. The concept of the "essential We" which Buber set forth in "What is Man?"[116] is expanded to encompass the larger realities of community living as represented in "What is Common to All."[117] As we will see later in our discussion of Responsibility, the category of the "essential We" corresponds on the level of the relation to a host of men to the "essential Thou on the level of Self-being." The "essential We" includes the Thou potentially, that is when independent people have come together in essential relation and directness, for "only men who are capable of truly saying Thou to one another can truly say We with one another." Buber, quoting Heracleitus' "One should follow the common", explains that one joins with others in building a common world of speech and a common order of being. Through this "essential We" and only through it can one escape from the isolated, impersonal man of the unknown faceless crowd. "A man is truly saved from the 'one' not by separation but only by being bound up in genuine communion."[118]

---

[113] Quoted in Pfeutze, Self, Society and Existence, p. 41.

[114] Buber, I and Thou, p. 6.

[115] Buber, The Knowledge of Man, p. 41.

C. With Spiritual Beings

Man regards ideal forms, ideas, deeds, works of Art as Thou, and he addresses his whole being to them. "Man and

---

[116] Buber, "What is Man?" in Between Man and Man, p. 118.

[117] Buber, "What is Common to All" in The Knowledge of Man.

[118] Buber, Between Man and Man, pp. 175 ff.

His Image - Work"[119] elaborates Buber's understanding of art as dialogue. Man, Buber holds, has a great desire "to enter into personal relation with things and to imprint on them his relation to them."

Louis Nizer, in his book, My Life in Court,[120] may help in indicating an I-Thou relation with an ideal or idea. He related his dream of being a trial lawyer fighting for the rights of an individual in the name of Justice. Commenting on the Inns of Court in London and on how one enters such places, he noted the architectural compulsion for respect for the historical profession as an interesting symbolism. "My own symbolism of awe and reverence for the law stems from a boyhood memory and involves my standing on tiptoe rather than bowing."[121] He goes on to share his experiences on entering "the Supreme Court building which was glamorous beyond compare." The gates and all in that building were "magically beautiful and exciting. I have read so often about a child's thrill when visiting the circus for the first time, I believe it does not compare with my enthrallment when walking through the courthouse."

Working day in and day out, meticulously preparing for the briefs, and researching all available relevant books and reports, the lawyer honestly and vigorously confronts the ideal of justice and gives wholeheartedly all his self. Nizer aptly describes this when he writes:

---

[119] Buber, "Man and His Image - Work" in The Knowledge of Man, pp. 149-65.

[120] New York: Pyramid Books, 1961.

[121] Ibid., p. 16.

> Even when I dared, on a few occasions, to go into the room, I still had to be guided by visual impressions because the words that came in the midst of the case seemed to hang incomprehensively in mid-air. Almost always I was outside standing on my toes, with my neck stretched to reach the window. This was the symbol of my prayerfulness, as if I were on bended knee. Some day, I was certain, I would push those doors open and enter as a lawyer participating in the highest function of all, the administration of justice. Since then I have fulfilled this dream. I have opened hundreds of courtroom doors in many states, but the excitement has never diminished, indeed it has grown. Surprise is ever present. The satisfactions of a noble calling are unique and bright.[122]

In and through each sphere, in its own way, we are really addressing the Eternal Thou. We look toward the fringe of the Eternal Thou.[123] The expressed approach of the creature, man's loving speech, the form's silent command -- all are gateways leading into the presence of the Word. "But when the full and complete meeting is to take place, the gates are united in one gateway of real life, and you no longer know through which you have entered."[124] In the Eternal Thou which can never be an It meet the extended lines of relations. This is the perfection of the dialogic relation.

---

[122] Nizer, My Life in Court, p. 17.

[123] Buber, I and Thou, p. 6.

[124] *Ibid.*, pp. 102 ff.

It is the element of address and response in all these three spheres of relation that we find Buber very profound in insights and implications which help and illumine the modern man in his feelings of isolation and alienation. Man's whole essential nature is fulfilled only if he lives with his whole self in all three relations, where he finds himself being addressed. Man stands claimed or addressed, and he may respond either, positively or negatively.

It is principally relevant to point out here that the sole essential relation of Kierkegaard's man is with God, to the exclusion of all other relations with nature, or men and spiritual or intelligible beings. On this aspect of exclusion, Buber, who has been influenced by Kierkegaard and other existentialists, parts company with Kierkegaard. Buber does not assert that man's often clumsy and inhibited relations with his fellow men can plumb the depths of life's mystery. But he, colored by Hasidic mysticism and religious wisdom, stresses out that objects or nature and other human beings can mediate man's approach to God and provide glimpses of the Eternal Thou.

Is there then a difference among the three spheres around which the I-Thou relation arises? Apparently, the difference lies not only in the nature of each sphere (with nature, with man and with spiritual beings) but also in the power of speech as indicated earlier. "But with what right do we draw," Buber asks, "what lies outside speech into relation with the world of the primary word?" "In every sphere in its own way, through each process of becoming that is present to us we look out toward the fringe of the Eternal Thou; in each we are aware of a breath from the eternal Thou, in each Thou we address the eternal Thou."[125]

Buber cites Goethe[126] as the man who most fully realized the I-Thou relation with the realm of nature; Socrates as the man who exemplified to the best the relation between man and man. He selects Jesus to demonstrate the deepest realization of the relation between man and the Eternal Thou. "... how powerful, even to being overpowering, and how legitimate, even to being self-evident, is the saying of I by Jesus. For it is the I of unconditional relation in which the man calls his Thou Father in such a way that he himself is simply Son, and nothing else but Son."[127] (See Buber's Two types of Faith, on Buber's discussion on Jesus, whom Buber found as his great brother.)

In his book, I and Thou, Buber speaks of life with the spiritual beings as quoted above,[128] whereas in his book, Between Man and Man he specifically mentions the third as "his relation to the mystery of being -- which is dimly apparent through all this but infinitely transcends it -- which the philosopher calls the Absolute and the believer calls God, and which cannot in fact be eliminated from the situation even by a man who rejects both designations."[129] Is there a difference? How does Buber understand this relation to God? Louis Nizer's experience cited earlier has enlightened us in indicating the relation of man with the ideal or idea of Justice, an intelligible or spiritual being. And how about man's relation to God?

---

[125] Buber, I and Thou, p. 6.

[126] Ibid., p. 66; Pointing the Way, p. 74.

[127] Ibid., pp. 66 f.

[128] Ibid., p. 6.

When man meets God, he does not actually see Him; he can't behold His face; he can't touch or feel His physical body. Like Moses of old who did not actually see God in his burning bush experience, man does not really see God. Yet, like Moses who knew that God was speaking to him that "mountain of Horeb where the angel of the Lord appeared to him in a flame of fire, out of the midst of a bush,"[130] man knows that God is speaking to him; he sees Him, he hears His voice.

We cannot speak to Him just as a professor speaks in a question and answer discourse to his students. We don't use words when we address God the way we utter words on our lips (of course we can). In order to address Him all of man's being is involved. Yet to that man who has relation with God, all things speak to him -- the world confronts him, the people he meets address him, the things around him say something to him. Yes, as Buber writes:

---

[129] Buber, I and Thou, p. 177.

[130] Exodus 3:1-2.

> The relation with man is the real simile of the relation with God; in it true address receives true response; except that in God's response everything, the universe, is made manifest as language.[131]

God, then, who is the Eternal Thou, is the One who speaks to man. He is the Eternal Thou whom man can address. We cannot speak of God, we can only meet Him. We can only address Him, even as He speaks to us.

To go out to the meeting with the Eternal Thou, man must become a whole man. He is a whole being who does not intervene in the world and one in whom no separate or partial action stirs. All other partial actions and plans are suspended and the whole of man is turned to Him. This going out to the Eternal Thou is not a meeting that is only in the mind of the person. This meeting is not just something in the mind of the person who is meeting which exists in man's mind like formula or a precept in a student's mind. Rather, the person going out to the meeting has "full acceptance of the present." This meeting needs no barrier of separation and any barrier of separation must be destroyed. With the wholeness of his life, man is aware of God, not only rationally, or spiritually, but also bodily -- he is wholeheartedly conscious. And when man meets the Eternal Thou, he still remains a person, a human being; he loses no identity. He does not become one with God like a drop of water in the vast ocean. Unlike the mystic who loses his own personality, that is, God and man becomes one, he is still a person, one person before another person. What is given up in the meeting is not his identity, not the I, but "that false self-asserting instinct that makes a man flee to possessing of things before the unreliable, perilous relation which has neither density nor duration and cannot be surveyed."[132]

---

[131] Buber, I and Thou, p. 103.

The person who enters into an absolute relation is concerned with nothing isolated. Everything is bound up in this relation. Of course, he sees people, things, the world of heaven; and he cannot disregard them, but he sees all of these in the Thou, and establishes the world in its true basis. He does not have to stay in the world, for by doing so he does not find Him; neither does he have to leave the world, for he does not find God by staying away from the world. What counts is his meeting the Thou with his whole being for "he who goes out with his whole being to meet his Thou and carries to it all being that is in the world, finds

---

[132] Buber, _I and Thou_, p. 78.

Him who cannot be sought."[133]

Man cannot seek Him: God can only be met. Of course, He is the "wholly Other" and Mysterium Tremendum, but He is also the "Wholly Same."[134] God is not only in people or in things (immanance), but He is also beyond people and things and the world (transcendence). On the other hand, He cannot be spatially located in the transcendence beyond things or within the immanence within things, and then be sought and found. He is the "mystery of the self-evident, nearer to me than I am."[135]

> If you explore the life of things and of conditioned being you come to the unfathomable, if you deny the life of things and of conditioned being you stand before nothingness, if you hallow this life you meet the living God.[136]

SECTION IV

THEORY OF RESPONSIBILITY

Buber, with a definite theory of responsibility which is found in his philosophy of dialogue (I-Thou relation) comes to offer his insights and ideas as we live in this world of people, needs, and opportunities. And in this section, I shall endeavor to present Buber's insights on Responsibility.

---

[133] Buber, I and Thou, p. 79.

[134] *Idem*.

[135] *Idem*.

[136] *Idem*.

> Genuine responsibility exists only where there is real responding. Responding to what? To what happens to one, to what is to be seen and heard and felt. Each concrete hour allotted to the person, with its content drawn from the world and from destiny, is speech for the man who is attentive.[137]

This group of sentences indicates how seriously Buber takes the issue of responsibility; and they give us a key to his understanding of responsibility. What is this real responding?, we may ask. How is this response given, and why? Who is this one who responds, and to whom such response is given? What exactly does the response consist of?

"Responsibility presupposes one who addresses one primarily, that is, from a realm independent of myself and to whom I am answerable."[138] The meaning of address becomes relevant, and response unfolds its rich meaning when we discuss further Buber's categories of man's two-fold attitude (I-Thou and I-It). Buber states and distinguishes three ways in which we are able to perceive a man who is living before our eyes. These are the observing, onlooking and becoming aware.[139] A man who has the functional attitude is the observer who is wholly intent on fixing the observed man in his mind. He probes him and writes him up as a man which, like an object, consists of traits. With an I-It attitude, man is also an onlooker.[140] He takes up the position which lets him see the object freely, and undisturbed awaits what will be presented to him. Unlike the observer, he does not take notes about traits but lets himself go. Both the observer and onlooker, Buber insists, are similarly oriented in that they have position which is the very desire to perceive the man. This man is, for them, an object separated from themselves and their personal life. The man which is an object, neither demands action from them nor inflicts destiny on them. This man is just a client who is one of the "cases" or "numbers" of a lawyer which he accepts in his legal profession.

---

[137] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 16.

[138] Ibid., p. 45.

[139] Ibid., p. 8.

The man with personal attitude, however, is one who is becoming aware of the "other" addresses something; this "other" speaks something that enters his own life. The man with personal response lives in the world of Thou. He finds everything as an address to him. Things no longer are things -- they become transparent, no longer screens which hide persons, but living signposts which point us to them. The world comes alive; it speaks and we enter into dialogue with it. The great figure of St. Francis of Assisi and how he conversed with the beasts, with the world and birds come into sharp focus. St. Francis had himself become so fully a person, and found such personal fellowship with God, that in everything he saw a person, a reflection of the person of God. To face the world with a personal attitude, to become a person, to discover the world of Thou, to acquire the sense of the person, to be more involved, become aware, and interested in human beings as persons than in their ideas, their personage, their colors and nationalities, means a complete revolution, changing the climate and texture of our lives and transforming our whole being. Once adopted, as one doctor says, it is an attitude which gradually and richly impregnates the whole of our lives.

---

[140] For further discussion, please see Buber's Man and His Image - Work, Knowledge of Man, where he makes the distinction between an artist as an onlooker and as one becoming aware of.

Situational Ethic

Buber's ethic is a situational ethic of responsibility. He extrapolates this by his profound personal experience with a young man when he writes:

> What happened was not more than that one forenoon, after a morning of "religious" enthusiasm, I had a visit from an unknown young man, without being there in spirit. I certainly did not fail to let the meeting be friendly, I did not treat him any more remissly than all his contemporaries who were in the habit of seeking me out about this time of day as an oracle that is ready to listen to reason. I conversed attentively and openly with him -- only I omitted to guess the questions which he did not put. Later, not longer after, I learned from one of his friends -- he himself was not longer alive -- the essential content of these questions; I

> learned that he had come to me not casually, but borne by destiny, not for a chat but for a decision. He had come to me, he had come in this hour. What do we expect when we are in despair and yet go to a man? Surely a presence by means of which we are told that nevertheless there is meaning.[141]

Since then, Buber confesses, "I have given up the 'religious' which is nothing but the exception, exaltation, ecstacy or it has given me up." He continues, "I possess nothing but everyday out of which I am never taken. The mystery is no longer disclosed, it has escaped or it has made its dwelling here where everything happens as it happens."[142]

Man claims and is claimed. He knows no hour except that hour when the address was made to him. That moment when he meets the Thou, that very hour faces him and the claim is made upon him. Each Thou demands his whole being; each event asks for his whole life, nothing more and nothing less. The whole claims him and he must answer.

In our discussion of Buber's three ways of perceiving a man who is living before our eyes, we have noted that awareness is something quite different from observing and looking. It is the difference between Thou and It. In awareness, the "other" is not my object but a Thou that "says" something to me. Each event, each person, each concrete hour which confronts us, is a speech for the man who is attentive. Being expectant and attentive is the beginning of awareness, and awareness leads to responsibility. For genuine responsibility exists only where there is real response.

---

[141] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 13.

[142] Ibid., pp. 13 f.

Man, who lives in two worlds with two-fold attitudes, is here and now; he is addressed and he needs to answer. Personally involved in his daily existence, he faces the challenges and opportunities of his day-to-day living. Constantly choices are present to him. And these choices claim him. He who is addressed is answerable. This claim carries with it the freedom to reject on the part of man; otherwise it would be compulsion, no longer claim. However, he is inescapably conditioned by it, for his acceptance or rejection of it becomes, instantly and possibly fatefully, part of the course of events in man's history. He is free to answer the claim. If he does not answer with his whole being, he is still answerable. He is still accountable, his refusal to answer, his refusal to give all his whole being in the relation, means a kind of a loss of selfhood.

However, if he responds with his whole being to the claim which is placed upon him, then he is not only responding but he is also responsible. He has really a genuine responsibility. Man's real humanity, his selfhood, his reality, consists both in his responding and in his being responsible. Whether he likes it or not, man finds himself in a situation in which he cannot deny his neighbor (anyone who addresses him) without denying his own essential nature and character, for essence, his wholeness, his fulfillment, is found only with others. In a profound sense, man must live in love and in faith if he is to live at all.

When no primary address or claim can reach man who is addressed, responsibility becomes a phantom, a delusion. Similarly, life's character of mutuality vanishes. Man fails to hear the word when he fails to make a response, for when man is addressed by the signs of life, God himself speaks to him. Concrete revelation comes in the concrete actual situations of life. Different men, objects, and animals, events and situations, joys and sorrows, privileges and opportunities, God employs these and others as His mouthpieces. As Buber says: "Our answering-for-ourselves is essentially our answering to divine address."[143] To him who is aware and responsible, God speaks in all the happenings and meetings of daily life. Responsibility is, then, in the last analysis, readiness to respond in the dialogue with God which takes place in the "lived moment" of existence.

MEMBERSHIP AND COMMUNITY: MEANING

A. Meaning in a Group

This situational sense of responsibility does not exclude man from membership in a group. Rather, it means that true membership in a community includes a boundary to membership so that no group or person can hinder one's awareness or perception of what is spoken or one's answer from the ground of one's being. Man lives with others in fellowship and yet he never gives up his personal responsibility nor his commitment to the group to stand in the way of his direct relationship to God.[144] As Buber says, "The man living in responsibility, can make even his political decision properly only from that ground of his being at which he is aware of the event as divine speech to him; and if he lets the awareness of this ground be strangled by his ground he is refusing to give God an actual reply."[145]

---

[143] Buber, At the Turning (New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1952), p. 56.

This discernment or perception is not an "inner light" from God that presents to one the answer at the same time as the question is asked. This awareness is not the "finger of God" which writes man's answer correctly. God tenders the situation, but the response comes from the "conscience" -- the "finger of conscience." Buber is not speaking of the routine, abused, worn out, superficial conscience, with whose discretion has also been abolished the conviction that man must still give an affirmative answer. Buber is pointing to the "unknown conscience in the ground of being, which needs to be discovered anew," that is, the unknown, the ever-newly discovered conscience which is active in every decision.[146] Something of God's grace enters into this response, but man cannot determine the amount, nor can he measure the share of grace in the answer (it is no man's answer to measure the amount of grace for His grace is immeasurable). Of course, man cannot be sure of this "finger of conscience," for this awareness is human and can be mistaken, but nevertheless man can make use of it (awareness), that is, he can respond with his whole being trusting that his answer is the right one. There is, thus, a personal certainty that is produced, the "uncertain certainty" of the person addressed and one who answers.[147]

---

[144] I can see Kierkegaard's influence on Buber on this particular point.

[145] Buber, At the Turning, p. 56.

Many are the ways in which the self tries to evade its responsibility in the existential dialogue of life, but they all add up in the end to the erection of some protective structure of fixed and final general rules (ideas, programs, values, standards, etc.,). These rules and techniques stand between the individual person and the "here and now," the situation, the event, which makes its demands upon him, so that it is not the individual person (the one who is addressed) who is deciding, but the general rules that decide for him. Buber says, "our age is content in escaping from the demanding 'ever anew' of such obligation of responsibility by a flight into a protective 'once for all.'"[148] Buber asserts that the responsible person is not defined and bound by things, by time and by norms, by circumstances and by conventions. He does not allow the group to which he belongs to relieve him from deciding, nor does his responsibility to the group hinder him from deciding, if he becomes aware that God ordains otherwise. No book of laws or rules is at hand to tell him what he must do in this very fateful moment and situation. This is his hour, his act for which he alone has to answer before God. Of course, the stock of ideas, materials, directions and suggestions from his friends may be of help, but these suggestions may not be substituted for responsible decision. Buber reminds us:

---

[146] Buber, Between Man and Man, pp. 69-70.

[147] Ibid., p. 69.

> No responsible person remains a stranger to norms. But the command inherent in a genuine norm never becomes a maxim, and the fulfillment of it never a habit. ... What it (command) has to tell him is revealed whenever a situation arises which demands of him a solution of which till then he had perhaps no idea.[149]

The call of the hour, the need of the situation demands nothing of what is past, what is gone. Thus, the responsible person gives his presence, his responsibility, and his whole being.

---

[148] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 70.

[149] Ibid., p. 114.

1. Decision and Relation

The responsible person who is willing to respond with his whole being can decide. "Only he who knows relation and knows about the presence of the Thou is capable of decision."[150] He who decides is free, for he has approached the Face. "Decision" here means both the current decision about the immediate situation which confronts one and through this the decision with the whole being for the Eternal Thou. In the reality of existence all the different and diverse decisions are merely variations on a single one, which is continually made afresh and anew in a single direction. This single direction is to be understood in a double sense as the direction toward the person meant for one and the direction toward God. This dual comprehension is just a "duality of aspects" presuming that one understands by God as someone really other than oneself, the Author and Finisher of one's created uniqueness who cannot be "expressed but only be addressed," Him who cannot be derived from within the world. Direction is made clear through one's inner awareness of what one is purposed to be, for it is this which enables one to really make a genuine decision.

2. Freedom and Relation

The responsible person is free, free from causation, process and defined being. He is free to really act in response to concrete external events. He sees what is new and unique in each situation, for he knows that he is being addressed. We make freedom real to ourselves, says Buber, by forgetting all that is past and by making decision out of the wholeness of our being. When we do this, destiny confronts us as the counterpart of our freedom. It is no longer our boundary but our fulfillment. The free, responsible, creative person ceases to be a "biologist" who looks at a person as an It. He knows the sight of the other side of human existence -- the world of persons, the world of relation (I-Thou). He knows that the realm of I-It orientation is not enough for the creative spirit of man. If he has to love, he must take periodic journeys from one realm to another realm, from the world of It to the world of Thou and vice versa.

---

[150] Buber, I and Thou, p. 51.

The reign of causality need not weigh heavily on the responsible man who is not defined and limited by the world of It. He can and does leave this world of It frequently for the world of Thou. And as he returns to the world of It which is characterized by causality and fate, he carries with him the spark of freedom, the vitality and vigor of a healthy trust in life, the glimpse of the world of Thou.[151]

Some of the contemporary psychological and sociological systems do not recognize or adequately proceed for human freedom and responsibility, observes Buber. The individual, in certain considerations, is only the product of biological drives. He is conditioned by inherited physical complexes and childhood influences. He is no longer the doer of his deeds, he is merely the battlefield on which biological and psychological drives, and social pressures fight for supremacy. Buber holds that the free man is not so, that is, he is not the man whose decision is determined by instincts, urges and social forces. To the free man, the social and psychological conditioning influences which he has internalized in the past are not the determining factors in making his decisions. "The free man is he who wills without arbitrary self-will." In going out to meet his destiny with his whole being, he "sacrifices his puny, unfree will, that is controlled by things and instincts, to his grand will, which quits defined for destined being."

---

[151] Buber, I and Thou, pp. 51, 53, 54.

> Then he intervenes no more, but at the same time he does not let things merely happen. He listens to what is emerging from himself, to the course of being in the world; not in order to be supported by it, but in order to bring it to reality as it desires, in its need of him, to be brought. ... The free man has no purpose here and means there, which he fetches for his purpose: he has only the one thing, his repeated decision to approach his destiny.[152]

What comes to the free man from without is only the precondition for his action; it does not determine its nature.

---

[152] Buber, I and Thou, p. 59.

He responds freely from the depths of his being as a whole and conscious person. He is not restricted by public status, social position or his neurosis so that he responds willingly and openly to what meets him. He does not "react" but he responds. Unlike the unfree person who sees people in terms of their prestige, their goodness and usefulness, the free man sees other persons as real persons, unique and precious. He sees them as persons with great potentialities and of value in themselves.

3. Direction and Relation

The responsible person who is free to enter into relation has direction. This awareness of direction is ultimately identical with the awareness of one's created uniqueness (the special way to God which finds full expression and realization in one's relation with the world, natural objects and men). The free man responds with the whole of his being to each new direction with no other preparation than his presence, his life and his readiness to respond. Direction, Buber says, is not meeting but going out to meet. It is not similar to the dialogue, but it is, along with personal wholeness and uniqueness, a prerequisite of any genuine dialogue. In a way it is a product of the dialogic life in the sense that the awareness of direction comes into being in the dialogue. That is, the awareness is revealed only as man meets the Thou.

4. Trust and Relation

At the base of the life of a person who stands ready to respond to the world, to man and to God, is the element of trust. He, who is addressed and who addresses, "keeps further" to respond with his whole being.

Buber, in his book Two types of Faith, defines trust as the perseverance of man in a hidden but self-revealing guidance. It is a trust in the faithfulness of God despite His different manifestation in different historic situations. This self-revealing guidance, of course, does not move from man the choice of taking and directing his own steps, for this guidance only indicates or shows that God is present. Like Moses of the Old Testament who believes that God was addressing him while he was in the mountain of Horab, the responsible man believes that God addresses him when he meets the Thou. Let Buber explain this point:

> Real faith does not mean professing what we hold true in a ready-made formula. On the contrary; it means holding ourselves open to the unconditioned mystery which we encounter in every sphere of our life and which cannot be comprised in any formula. It means that from the very roots of our being, we should always be prepared to live with this mystery as one being lives with another.[153]

Faith is the meeting with the Eternal Thou who is both Other and Present One who addresses man and who makes claim upon him. In the moment of supreme meeting, man receives revelation which is "presence and power,"[154] (which we will discuss later in a more elaborate way). Buber says that God's "presence and power" is eternal revelation which is present here and now.

---

[153] Buber, Israel and the World,"Essays in a Time of Crisis", p. 49. See also Schipp and Friedman, eds., The Philosophy of Martin Buber, 1967, pp. 27-30.

B. Community

The responsible man can only succeed in raising relation to constancy if he continually enters into an I-Thou relation. Of course, this is not to say that he must completely overcome the relation of It, but what Buber means here is that, the responsible man, as he returns to the world of It, that world of "experiencing and using," carries with him the vigor of a healthy trust in life, that spark or breath of the world of Thou.[155] His man must continue to confirm another person, for it is only when there is mutual confirmation that the "heavenly bread of self-being is passed." Buber categorically declares that man wishes to be confirmed in his being by another man, and wishes to have presence in the being of the other. Thus Buber writes:

> The basis of man's life with man is two-fold, and it is one -- the wish of every man to be confirmed as what he is, even as what he can become, by men; and the innate capacity in man to confirm his fellowmen in this way. That this capacity lies so immeasurably fallow constitutes the real weakness and

---

[154] Buber, I and Thou, pp. 110-11.

[155] *Ibid.*, pp. 51, 53, 54.

> questionableness of the human race: actual humanity exists only where this capacity unfolds. ...[156]

In confirming another as a unique person, that is, a whole man who can enter into dialogic relation, the responsible man is able to convey the meaning of true community. True community, Buber holds, emerges out of the I-Thou relation. Just as the individual becomes a person, "a fact of existence," insofar as he steps into a living relation with other individuals, so does a social aggregate become a community. This community is built out of living relations (I-Thou). Buber continues to explain, "only men who are capable of truly saying Thou to one another can truly say We with one another."[157] And just as the I of authentic personality emerges only in the dialogic meeting with God to which every other Thou points, so does the authentic We of community come forth only out of the relation of the individual members of the group to the transcendent. Buber writes:

> The true community does not arise through peoples having feelings for one another (though indeed not without it), but through, first, their taking their stand in living mutual relation with a living Centre, and second, their being in living mutual relation with one another. The second has its source in the first, but is not given when the first alone is given. Living mutual relation includes feelings, but does not originate with them. The community is built up out of living mutual relation,

---

[156] Buber, "Existence and Relations," tr. by Ronald Gregor Smith, The Hibbert Journal, XXIX, January, 1950, 102.

[157] Buber, Between Man and Man, pp. 203, 176.

but the builder is the living effective Centre.[158]

Who is this Centre? Who is this eternal Thou in whom the extended lines of relations meet? Buber's understanding of this Eternal Thou has been mentioned extensively in Section III Three-fold Relation, but may I add some comments here using some other mystics and great men to express the same meaning.

1. The Eternal Thou

God cannot be possessed, for He can never be an It.[159] God can only be met. "Woe to the man so possessed that he thinks he possesses God."[160] God can only be encountered. Albert Schweitzer, that great man of our generation, experientially and forcefully explains: "It is only through the manifestations of Being and only through those with which I enter into relations that my being has an intercourse with infinite being. The devotion of my being to infinite Being means devotion of my being to all the manifestations of being which need my devotion and to which I am able to devote myself."[161] Of course in Buber's terms, these manifestations which Schweitzer speaks of include nature, the world, men and animals, and other spiritual beings and intelligible forms.

---

[158] Buber, I and Thou, p. 45.

[159] Ibid., p. 75.

[160] Ibid., p. 106.

[161] Schweitzer, Civilization and Ethics, tr. by S. T. Campion (New York: Macmillan Co.), quoted in Gollancz, Man and God, p. 476.

God is the "wholly Other"; but He is also the wholly Same, the Wholly Present.[162] Tagore, the Nobel Prize winner of India, beautifully illustrates the immanence of God when he writes: "He is there where the tiller is tilling the hard ground and when the pathmaker is breaking stones. He is with them in sun and in shower, and his garment is covered with dust. Put off the holy mantle and even like him come down on the dusty soil!"[163] Again stressing the "presence of God," and man's need to be comforted with the "wear and tear" of daily life, Tagore writes, "Deliverance? Where is this deliverance to be found? Our master himself has joyfully taken upon him the bonds of creation; he is bound with us all forever. Come out of thy meditations and leave aside thy flowers and incense! What harm is there if thy clothes become tattered and stained? Meet him and stand by him in toil and in sweat of thy brow."[164] And I think it is Angelus Sileus (Pseudonym for Johann Scheller, German physician and mystical poet, 1624-77) who captured the "wholly otherness" of God when he included in his *The Spiritual Maxims of Angelus Silesius*,[165] the following verse:

---

[162] Buber, *I and Thou*, p. 79.

[163] Tagore, *Sadhana*, p. 61.

[164] Rabindranath Tagore, *The Creative Unity* (New York: The Macmillan Co.).

[165] Tr. by Henry Bett, Epworth Press.

God in me, God without! Beyond Compare!
A being wholly here and wholly there!

Buber adds to this: "Of course He is the Mysterium Tremendum that appears and overthrows; but He is also the mystery of the evident, nearer to me than my I."[166]

Buber believes that we cannot know "God-in-Himself." We can only know Him as a person, since this is the way He meets us in relation. On the other hand, Diamond warns us, "the attempt to communicate religious reality in the language of philosophy raises a further problem." "Persons as we know them," Diamond explains, "are limited whereas God, as we encounter Him, is without limit."[167] This dilemma places Buber to talk in his book, Eclipse of God,[168] "The Love of God and the Idea of Deity," to speak of the "absolute Person" we name God. "Can this," Buber says, "be taken to mean that God 'is' a personality? The absolute character of His personality, that paradox of paradoxes, prohibits any such statement. It only means that God loves as a personality and that He wishes to be loved like a personality." God cannot be spatially located (in the transcendence) beyond things or (within the immanence) within things, and then be sought and found. This encounter with God, Buber asserts, is not a special intuition of mysteries. Rather, this meeting with God takes place in and enriches the toil in the soil, the menial of manual labor, the shadows and sunshine of living, the ebbs and flows of daily tide and life in its workaday world, and with pains and joys of relations with all creation. For in all these, we see a glimpse of the eternal Thou.[169]

---

[166] Buber, I and Thou, p. 79.

[167] Diamond, Martin Buber ..., p. 81.

[168] Buber, Eclipse of God, p. 81.

Wholesome relationship is finally fulfilled and enriched only in the meeting with ultimate reality -- Eternal Thou.[170] This Eternal Thou can never be an It for us. The Eternal Thou can only be addressed and never expressed. Hence in this time and age of dominance of I-It relation, God is eclipsed.

To the question: Is God always self-revealing as man relates himself with other Thous and the mystery of being?, Buber's answer can be found in many of his books.[171] The gist would be that "... the living God is not only a self-revealing but also a self-concealing God."[172] Again and again he refers to the Bible as a basis for this conviction. The Bible verse is Isaiah 45:15 which runs thus: "Verily Thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel, the Savior."

---

[169] Buber, I and Thou, pp. 87 f.

[170] Ibid., p. 75. See Eclipse of God, pp. 44-45. See Reuel Howe, The Miracle of Dialogue (New York: The Seabury Press, 1965) for a discussion on the third tragedy which attends interrupted dialogue as a natural consequence of broken relationship and death of the person. Howe thinks there is "loss of God. ...", p. 87.

[171] Buber, Eclipse of God, Two Types of Faith, At the Turning, The Prophetic Faith.

[172] Buber, Eclipse of God, pp. 89, 101, 139.

Fully aware of this truth of hiding as well as a revealing God as a way of pointing to the mystery of dialogue itself, Buber has been in struggle and search for images which would capture the depth, meaning and marvel of this mystery. "The waves of the aether roar on always but for most of the time we have turned off our receivers."[173] This image shows man's failure to "present ourselves and to perceive" life's signs. Man is so encased in armour the task of which is to ward off signs and symbols of life. Events take place, opportunities are opened, situations happen. These and others are presented as personal speech of God challenging the individual person to face them and decisively move onward. "Often enough we think there is nothing to hear, but long before we have ourselves put wax in our ears."[174] Again in his description of the eclipse of the light of heaven which he terms as the character of the historic hour through which the world is passing, Buber holds that it is not only in man's failure to see the signs but something happens. "But it (eclipse of God) is not a process which can be adequately accounted for by instancing the changes that have taken place in man's spirit. An eclipse of the sun is something that occurs between the sun and our eyes, not in the sun itself."[175] In another vein, Buber uses an image which suggests that the human will can help restore the dialogue between God and man (as we will see later in our discussion on Man's Training and God's Grace, Section V). "Its light seems darkened only because the eye suffers from a cataract; the receiver has been turned off, but the resounding other has not ceased to vibrate."[176]

---

[173] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 11.

[174] Buber, I and Thou, Postscript, p. 137.

The underlying conviction portrayed by these images is the never-failing, steadfast love of God. It is also the foundation of Buber's belief that "the eternal Thou can by its nature not become an It."[177]

Buber has tried to show who this living God is in many images. And though he has not devised an exhaustive, definitive statement of and on this God (which I don't think, he wants to do so), still this saying in his book, Hasidism, seems to give us a glimpse of how Buber thinks of and encounters the Eternal Thou:

> The great achievement of Israel is not so much that it has told mankind of the one, real God, the origin and goal of all that exists, but rather that it has

---

[175] Buber, Eclipse of God, p. 23.

[176] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 117.

[177] Buber, I and Thou, pp. 112, 75, 100.

> taught men that they can address this God is very real, that men can say Thou to Him, that we human beings can stand face to face with Him, that there is communion between God and man.[178]

SECTION V

MAN'S TURNING AND GOD'S GRACE

There is the dialogue between God and man. It is a reality. God speaks to man every moment of his life. God continually seeks him and He comes with the assurance, "Lo I am with you always."

But man again and again runs away. He falls down many times in the world of It, where life spells no meaning, address and joy, but an array of walking robots and machines in a manipulative, monotonous routine. This is the "evil", Buber comments, because this world is just a big "vale of tears" where people are human cogs in a huge machine. Man is always in the cross-words of indecisions, without any sense of direction, balance and perspectives. The beauty of human relationship and the power of accepting love and active cooperation among self-actualizing and creative people are just phantom. The existence of or even the mere word "God" exudes no feelings, insights, relation, or hope. Life is all shadows without sunshine, all darkness without light. And perhaps no blood, no life at all!

---

[178] Buber, Hasidism, "Spinoza, Sabbatai Zevi, and the Baalshem," p. 96.

Created in the divine image of God, man suddenly wakes up from his mental and spiritual lethargy and finds himself in the unbroken world of Thou which can never become an It. The all-pervading Thou can never be an It no matter how man tiredlessly aims and proudly places himself as the all-mighty, all-powerful, the creator, and the source. Man need only to stand up again and enters the world of I-Thou relation, and there is the all-accepting, the loving eternal Thou who joyously welcomes him into the fellowship with the "thou" of creation and the "thou" of the Creator. Man's decision to turn wholeheartedly to the I-Thou meeting is the beginning of a much-awaited, restored fellowship. His wholeness of response in dialogue encounters with the "thou" of everything constitutes the "good" of man.

And this is the section where we shall deal quite extensively the nature of "evil" and the redeeming, redemptive gift of the dialogic (I-Thou) relation, and its hopes and possibilities.

A. Nature of Evil

In his book, Good and Evil, Buber writes that "it is usual to think of good and evil as two poles, two opposite directions, two arms of a signpost pointing to right and left. ..."[179] Good and evil are "understood as belonging to the same plane of being, as the same in nature, but the antithesis of one another."[180] This is so, Buber observes, because they are treated as "ethical abstractions" rather than as "existent states of human reality." We must look at them "in the factual content of the life of the human person," thus Buber advises, and we will discover their "fundamental dissimilarity in nature, structure, and dynamics."[181]

---

[179] Martin Buber, Good and Evil (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 121.

> Good and evil, then, cannot be a pair of opposites like right and left or above and beneath. "Good" is the movement in the direction of home, "evil" is the aimless whirl of human potentialities without which nothing can be achieved and by which, if they take no direction but remain trapped in themselves, everything goes awry. If the two were indeed poles the man who did not see them as such would be blind; but the man would be blinder who did not perceive the lightening flash from pole to pole, the "and."[182]

Evil, for Buber, is both absence of direction and absence of relation, for relation and direction, as he uses them, are different aspects of the same reality. The man who cannot say Thou with his whole being to God or man, may have the sublime illusion of detached thought that he is self-creator so much so that he finds no need to have relation with God, man and things, is a man who is lost.[183]

---

[180] Buber, Good and Evil, p. 121.

[181] Ibid.

[182] Buber, Between Man and Man, pp. 78-79.

[183] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 168; Good and Evil, p. 143.

Buber may not disagree with what Aldous Huxley says: "Good is that which makes for unity; Evil is that which makes for separateness."

Buber sees evil as emerging in two stages. In the first stage which he finds typified in the stories of Adam and Eve and Cain, evil in man is decisionless, directionlessness. It is something that cannot be done with the whole being, something that falls under the shadow of the predominance of the I-It. For "only he who knows relation and knows about the presence of the Thou is capable of decision. He who decides is free,"[184] so Buber holds. In the I-Thou, there is direction, wholeness. In the second stage, typified in the story of the Tower of Babel and in the Iranian myth of Yima, evil is wrong decision, decision in self-sufficiency against God. It is the existential lie against being in which man sees himself as self-creator.[185] Again, it is the primal guilt of remaining with oneself,[186] but it is a much more sinister form of it. For in this second stage, the evil becomes obsessive and demonic. "Sin is not an undertaking which man can break off when the situation becomes critical, but a process started by him, the control of which is withdrawn from him at a fixed moment."[187] "If we may compare the occurrence of the first stage to an eccentric whirling movement, the process of the freezing of flowing water may serve as a simile to illustrate the second."[188] Man's self-assertion against God leads to his utter enslavement. This is so because man is created and called upon to be a partner, and "lovingly take part in the still uncompleted work."[189] And as a partner, he must give all his life to such a task. Once he asserts himself as self-made man and as a self-creator, then his downfall is inevitable.[190] He sins.

---

[184] Buber, I and Thou, p. 51.

[185] Buber, Good and Evil, pp. 107-13; see also Friedman, Martin Buber, ..., p. 107.

[186] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 166.

[187] Buber, Two Types of Faith, p. 84.

In his interpretation of Psalm 1 (Right and Wrong),[191] Buber makes an essential and important distinction between the "wicked" man and the "sinner" corresponding to the two stages of evil. The sinner misses God's way again and again, while the wicked opposes it. "Sinner" portrays a condition which from time to time overcomes a man without adhering to him, whereas "wicked" describes a kind of man, a persistent disposition. "The sinner does evil, the wicked man is evil. That is why it is said only of the wicked, and not of sinners, that their way peters out and that they are like the chaff which a wind sweeps away."[192] Although the sinner is not confirmed by the human community, he may be able to stand before God, and even entry into the human community is not closed to him if he carries out that turning into God's way which he desires in the depths of his heart. The "wicked," in contrast, does not "stand" in the judgment before God. His way is his own judgment; since he has negated his existence, he ends in nothing. Does this mean that the way of God is closed to the wicked man? "It is not closed from God's side ... but it is closed from the side of the wicked themselves. For in distinction from the sinners they do not wish to be able to turn."[193] Thus there arises for us the question of how an evil will can exist when God exists. To this question, says Buber, no human word knows the answer: "The abyss which is open by this question stretches, even more uncannily than the abyss of Job's question, into the darkness of the divine mystery."[194]

---

[188] Buber, Good and Evil, p. 140.

[189] Buber, At the Turning, p. 39.

[190] Buber, Israel and the World, "The Two Foci of the Jewish Soul," p. 34.

[191] Buber, Right and Wrong, An Interpretation of some Psalms, tr. R. G. Smith (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952).

Over against the opinions and convictions of scholars and theologians who believe man to be sinful and fallen, Buber views man as essentially neither good or evil, nor simply the indeterminate possibility of either, rather, man "is in a preeminent sense good and evil together."[195]

---

[192] Buber, Good and Evil, p. 59.

[193] Ibid., p. 59.

[194] Ibid., pp. 59 f.

[195] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 78.

Yes, man is just limited, and not sinful, however the limitation is actual (as we mentioned earlier on the Section I Beginning With Oneself). "The limitation does not transform his essence or destroy God's work."[196]

In his book, Hasidism, Buber holds that "God has created a world, and he has pronounced his creation to be very good -- from when then comes the evil?"[197] God, Buber continues to expound, has kept to himself the deep secret of Good and Evil.[198] On the other hand, we are assured as mentioned in Section IV, that man has the freedom to accept God or totally reject Him. Man can refuse to be aware of life's signs or he may receive them as divine address. The failure to receive what God freely accords to man contributes to much of the evil around. Buber, emphasizing the necessary role of the I-It, yet reminding us of the vital, nourishing, ever-accessible world of Thou, shows man of his limited nature. It is man who is not always faithful to the meeting, for God never fails to keep his promise and assurances.

Two Hasidic sayings seem relevant here in Buber's musing of good and evil.

---

[196] Buber, Between Man and Man, pp. 78 f.

[197] Buber, Hasidism, p. 105.

[198] Ibid., p. 106.

> But if there were evil, there would be no good, for good is the counterpart of evil. ... For there is no good unless its counterpart exists. ... That fact that evil confronts good give man the possibility of victory: of rejecting evil and choosing good. Only then does the good exist truly and perfectly.
>
> Evil too is good. It is the lowest rung of perfect goodness. If you do good deeds, even evil will become good; but if you sin, evil will really become evil. How then can it contain good and evil, which are self-contradictory. But actually there is no contradiction, for evil is the throne of good.[199]

I wonder whether Buber would concur with Samuel Alexander when the latter said: "Evil is not therefore wholly evil; it is misplaced good."[200] Again, Buber echoes the same sentiment when he contends:

> What we call evil is found not only in man, it is also the Evil in the world; it is the defilement of creation. But this defilement is nothing positive, it is not an existing character of things. It is only their lack of firmness, their lack of direction, their vacilation.[201]

In a terse sentence, Buber defines evil as "the convulsive shirking of direction, of the total orientation of the soul by which it stands up to personal responsibility before God."[202]

---

[199] Buber, Ten Rungs, pp. 89-90, 90-91.

[200] Quoted in Victor Gollancz, Man and God, p. 96.

[201] Buber, Hasidism, p. 105.

[202] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 79.

Would one say then from what we have discussed that Buber does not have a sense of radical evil before and against all beings? In his article, "The Question to the Single One,"[203] Buber answers this when he maintains that "man is 'fallen' only in relation to God, not to other men or to human institutions. No institutions of leadership and learning or political machinery may play the role of defense lawyer or intercessor between God and man. No concept or formula of long life or theorems of State can plead for the redemption and freedom of man. Let us record the exact words of Buber:

> In the sight of God, a state of radical evil can be ascribed to man because God is God and man is man, and the distance between them is absolute, and because precisely in this distance and in virtue of it God's redeeming deed is done. In the sight of his fellow-men, of human groups and orders, man, it seems to me, cannot be properly described as simply sinful, because the distance is lacking which alone is able to establish the unconditional. Nothing is changed if a human order is considered as established or empowered by God. ... no legitimate use can be made in politics or political theory of the concept of human sinfulness.[204]

B. Man's Turning and God's Grace

"Man's turning from evil and taking the direction toward God is the beginning of his own redemption and that of the world."[205] Would Buber object to what Paracelsus declared: "God will do nothing without Man. If God works a miracle he does it through man?" "God wishes to redeem us, but only by our own acceptance of His redemption with the turning of the whole being."[206] Man's turning is only the beginning, however, for his action must be answered by God's grace for redemption to be complete. When man goes forth to meet God, He comes to meet him, and this meeting is his salvation. "Even in the dark hour after he has become guilty against his brother, man is not abandoned to the forces of chaos. God Himself seeks him out, and even when He comes to call him to account, His coming is salvation."[207] The man who is able to decide which way to go, and whose decision is allowed to contribute to the forging of the world's fate, and who "turns, cooperates in the redemption of the world." Buber says:

---

[203] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 79.

[204] Ibid., p. 77.

> It is not as though any definite act of man could draw grace down from heaven; yet grace answers deed in unpredictable ways, grace unattainable, yet not self-withholding. It is not as though man has to do this or that "to hasten" the redemption of the world -- "he that believeth shall not make haste"; yet those who turn cooperate in the redemption of the world. The extent and nature of the participation assigned to the creature remains secret. "Does that mean that God cannot redeem his world

---

[205] Friedman, Martin Buber ..., p. 138.

[206] Buber, Israel and the World, "The Man of Today and the Jewish Bible," p. 102.

[207] Buber, At the Turning, p. 46.

> without the help of his creatures?" "It means that God does not will to be able to do it." "Has God need of man for his work?" "He wills to have need of man."[208]

It is foolish, therefore, to try and divide redemption into a part that is dependent on man and a part that is dependent on God. Man must be concerned with his own action alone before he brings it about, with God's grace alone after the action is successfully done. "Grace concerns us insofar as we go out to it and persist in its presence; but it is not our object."[209] St. John Chrysostom reminds us: "Grace cannot do anything without (human) will, nor will anything without grace."[210] When man breaks through, he has an immediate experience of his freedom; after his decision has been made, he has an immediate experience that God's hand has carried him.[211] Man's action and God's grace are subsumed under the greater reality of the dialogue between God and man.

The decisive turning is not merely an attitude of the soul but something effective in the whole corporeality of totality of life. It is not to be identified with repentance, for repentance is something psychological and purely inward which shows itself only in its "consequences" and "effects."

---

[208] Buber, Israel and the World, "Two Foci of the Jewish Soul," p. 32.

[209] Buber, I and Thou, p. 76.

[210] Quoted in Gallancz, V, Man and God, p. 9.

[211] Buber, The Prophetic Faith, pp. 104, 124.

> Turning is something which happens in the immediacy of the reality between man and God. The turning is as little a "psychic" event as is a man's birth or death; it comes upon the whole person, is carried out by the whole person, and does not occur as a man's self-intercourse, but as the plain reality of primal mutuality.[212]

Turning is not a roundabout or return to an earlier "sinless situation. It is the revolution of the whole being, in the course of which "man is projected onto the way of God." "The man who turns finds himself standing in the traces of the living God."[213]

The turning to God is born in the depths of the soul out of "the despair which shatters the prison of our latent energies" and out of the suffering which purifies the soul. In his darkest hours man feels the hand of God reaching down to him. If he has "the incredible courage" to take the hand and let it draw him up out of darkness and oblivion and despair, he tastes the essence of redemption -- the saving knowledge that his "Redeemer liveth" and wishes to save him. But he must accept this redemption with the turning of his whole being, for only thus can he extricate himself from the maze of selfishness and loneliness where he has always set himself as his goal and find a way to God and to the fulfillment of the particular task for which he is intended.[214] He must go out from his small circle and turn to other day by day as he faces his own responsibilities, and does his daily duties. "Only the turning of the normal life as it happens from day to day toward God, only the hallowing of the natural union with the world, have the redeeming power. The All-Day of redemption grown only out of the redemption of every day," so Buber reminds us.[215]

---

[212] Buber, Israel and the World, "The Faith of Judaism," p. 20.

[213] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

"To turn one's whole life toward God and then to let it expand in all its moments even till the last, that is man's work toward redemption."[216] To turn to God with the whole of one's being means to turn with all of one's potentialities etc.

> If you direct the undiminished power of your fervor to God's world destiny, if you do what you must do at this moment ... with your whole strength and wish ... holy intent, you will bring about the union between God and Shekinah, eternity and time. ... All that is necessary is to have a soul united within itself and invisibly directed to its divine goal.[217]

---

[214] Buber, The Way of Man, pp. 35 f.

[215] Buber, Hasidism, p. 112.

[216] Ibid., p. 116.

[217] Martin Buber, Tales of Hasidism, The Early Masters, tr. by Olga Marx (New York: Schocken Books, 1947), p. 4.

CHAPTER III

SUZUKI'S UNDERSTANDING OF SELFHOOD

Preliminary Remarks

Like Buber whose philosophy of dialogue delineates his distinctive thoughts and insights on personhood, Suzuki's writings on Zen present to us a wealth of ideas on the perennial question: What is man? The same questions we asked of Buber may not be equally relevant in the case of Suzuki. On the other hand, an investigation of the latter's interpretation of Zen will certainly be a worthwhile task. How does Zen look at reality? What potentialities does man possess which make him a new man? What can man do to realize his true selfhood? On these and other questions Suzuki may enlighten us.

There is no question now as to the influence of Zen Buddhism on Western thought, not to mention its lasting value in Japanese religious and philosophical thought, the arts and other disciplines. Some famous practicing psychiatrists, notably Jung and K. Horney,[1] have pointed out the practicality of Zen. Heidegger,[2] expressing the same sentiment as Lynn White[3] is quoted to as saying: "If I understand Dr. Suzuki correctly, this is what I have been trying to say in all my writings."

---

[1] Both Jung and Horney were interested in the therapeutic possibilities in Zen. The former wrote about Zen while the latter before her death visited Japan to observe the life of a Zen monastery at first hand. Horney saw in terms of her own psychology the search for self-realization without the false image of an idealized self and without the dependent leaning on external anchors like family or social groups.

Basho is a literary figure in whose life and style is personified the haiku poetry at its highest peak in Japan. Regarding the relation of Zen and Basho it can be asserted, writes Miyanishi, that "Zen formed the very foundation upon which both his literary achievement, to be known later as the Basho style (Shofu), and his lofty yet solitary personality were developed.[4]

Suzuki is known to the West as the foremost interpreter and greatest authority on Zen.[5] Not only is he a scholar himself, but also he is an outstanding and well-respected Buddhist. In company with other writers like Pratt,[6] H. Smith,[7] Conze,[8] Hutchison,[9] Humphrey,[10]

---

[2] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism: Selected Writings, ed. by W. B. Barrett, p. xi.

[3] White, L. Frontiers of Knowledge in the Study of Man, pp. 304-05.

[4] Miyanishi Kimamoto, "Basho and Zen," Toyo University Asian Studies, No. 2, 1940, 15-29.

[5] Fromm, et al., Psychoanalysis and Zen Buddhism.

[6] Pratt, The Pilgrimage of Buddhism.

[7] Smith, The Religions of Man.

[8] Conze, Buddhism, Its Essence and Development.

[9] Hutchison and Martin, Ways of Faith.

[10] Humphreys, Zen Buddhism.

Ross;[11] Barrett[12] in his introduction on Zen Buddhism records:

> I consider it a great stroke of personal good fortune to have stumbled and quite by chance upon the writings of D. T. Suzuki years ago. ... My interest in his writings has been what it is simply because these writings shed light upon problems in my own life -- one proof that Zen does have a much needed message for the Westerner.[13]

Barrett observes that there is a list of good books on Zen Buddhism but "what makes Suzuki unique -- and unique not only among writers on Buddhism but among contemporary religious writers generally is that he starts from the assumption that Buddhism is a living thing that began some 2,500 years ago with Gotama's experience of enlightenment, has been developing ever since, and is still alive and growing." Steeped thoroughly in Chinese Buddhism, Suzuki is unique indeed, Barrett explains further, because of the "extraordinary freshness and vitality of his writings. ..."[14]

Sakamoto,[15] in his review of Benz's _Zen in Westlicher Sicht_, clarifies Suzuki's central aim in his writing on Zen, that is, "to elucidate the unique significance of Zen as clearly as possible, which significance, relating to the problem of Man today, is immensely challenging and thought-provoking to the philosophies as well as the religions of the world today." Suzuki never wanted to secularize Zen and make a world-wide campaign of propagating Zen as an up-to-date substitute for religion, as Benz surmised. Nor, on the contrary, was it to have the West know Zen within the limits of a religious school belonging to Mahayana Buddhism in the Far East, explains Sakamoto.

---

[11] Ross, _The Meaning of Life in Hinduism and Buddhism_.

[12] Suzuki, _Zen Buddhism_, ...

[13] _Ibid_., p. viii.

[14] _Ibid_., p. ix.

[15] Benz, _Zen in Westlicher Sicht. Zen Buddhissmus-Zen-Snobismus_ (Weilhelm/ Oberbayern: Otto Wilhelm Barth-Verlad, 1962), _The Eastern Buddhist_, Vol. 1, 1, September 1965, 126-32.

"With the death of Dr. D. T. Suzuki on July 12, 1966, the world lost one of its most eminent Buddhist scholars and a great human being," writes Kitagawa.[16] Suzuki is known for an extensive scholarship and travel, personal strong conviction and a mastery of English, German and French prose. Humphreys describes him: "Dr. Suzuki writes with authority. Not only has he studied original works in Sanskrit, Pali, Chinese and Japanese, but he has an up-to-date knowledge of Western thought in German and French as well as in the English which he speaks and writes so fluently."[17]

One of several sons of Ryojun and Masu (Kojiman) Suzuki, D. T. Suzuki was born in Kauazaan, Japan on

---

[16] Kitagawa, "Daisetz Teitero Suzuki," in History of Religions, Vol. 6, 3, February 1967, 265-69.

[17] Humphreys, "Editor's Foreword," in Suzuki's Essays in Zen Buddhism, First Series, pp. 7-9.

October 18, 1870. His forebears were traditionally physicians who belonged to the Samurai class, whose privileges were taken away shortly after Emperor Mutsuhito reigned in 1876. Still a young boy he lost his father; and he was not able to finance himself at the medical school. Thus upon completion of his secondary school education, young Suzuki became a teacher in a fishing village.

Later while at Tokyo, he took courses at irregular times at the Imperial University where he was studying English literature and was greatly influenced among others by Emerson. He found himself gradually spending his time at the Zen Monastery in Kamakura, near Tokyo. There he underwent the discipline of a novice. Impressed with his pupil's brilliant mind, Shaku Soyen, his Zen master and teacher of Pali Scriptures, recommended young Suzuki to a position in 1897 in the United States as a translator at the Open Court Publishing Co. in La Salle, Illinois. He worked there for eleven years. Two of his earliest translations from the Chinese texts are Awakening of Faith (1900) and the classic Tao Te Ching which he did in cooperation with Dr. Paul Carus. He also translated the writings of the Swedish philosopher Emmanuel Swedenborg from English to Japanese when he spent some time in Europe. "Already he was," writes Winthrop Sargeant, "assuming the peculiar role of interpreter of Eastern religious ideas for the West and Western religious ideas for the East that he has played ever since."[18]

In 1909, he returned to Tokyo to become a professor of English at the Imperial University. He held this post until 1914 and was also a professor of English at Gakushi-u (Peers' School in Tokyo). Two years later he married Beatrice Lane, a college teacher who was interested in Oriental Philosophy whom he met during his first stay in the United States. In 1921 he left the second school and became a professor of English and of Buddhist philosophy at Otani University in Kyoto. During his fruitful 19-year stay at Otani until 1940[19] he gained popularity in Japan and abroad.

During World War II, Suzuki was under suspicion in his own country for his opposition to militarism. His interpretation and analytical study of Zen became gradually known to Western students of Oriental Philosophy. After the loss of his wife, who died in the summer of 1939, followed by the outbreak of World War II, he kept rather much to himself. His thoughts were focused more on the meaning of religious experience especially Zen both as an intellectual and practical problem. His emphasis on experience as the foundation of religious life, which is evident in all his writings, during the war, is succinctly stated by him:

---

[18] New Yorker, August 31, 1957.

[19] Kitagawa lists a good number of books written during this period. See History of Religions, Vol. 6, 3 and also Bibliography.

> To study Zen means to have Zen-experience, for without the experience there is no Zen one can study. But mere experience means to be able to communicate it to others; the experience ceases to be vital unless it is adequately expressible. A dumb experience is not human. To experience is to be self-conscious. Zen-experience is complete only when it is backed by Zen consciousness and finds expression in one way or another.[20]

In 1946 Suzuki founded the Matsuga-Oka Bunko (Pine Hill Library) in Kamakura and remained its director till his death. His lectures include those given before the Emperor of Japan in 1946 and in 1951 and those given in other countries. He has lectured at different universities in Europe including Cambridge, Oxford, Edinburgh, Munich and at the Jung Psychological Institute in Zurich. Since 1951 he has been living for the most part in different countries and has lectured at Yale, Chicago, Princeton, Harvard, Cornell Universities. All these have been under the sponsorship of the Rockefeller Foundation. Not only has he been a visiting professor at Columbia University but also Suzuki has lectured for two summers at the University of Mexico. "He gave generously of his time to innumerable scholars, students and seekers who came to him for counseling and advice. He was willing to take even a very naive question seriously, though he himself never claimed to be an effective teacher."[21]

---

[20] D. T. Suzuki, "Interpretation of Zen Experience," in Charles A. Moore (ed.), Philosophy East and West (Princeton, 1946), p. 110.

[21] Kitagawa, "D. T. Suzuki," Ibid., p. 268.

Moreover, he has presented seminar papers at many significant conferences like the World Congress of Faiths in London in 1936, the second East-West Philosophers' Conference in Honolulu in 1949, at the World Fellowship of Buddhists in Tokyo in 1952. At one time, he gave lectures on Zen and the art of swordsmanship at the Institute of Contemporary Arts in Washington, D.C.

A holder of an honorary D. Lit. degree conferred by Otani University, he was president of the Tibetan Tripitak Research Institute and played an active role in ceremonies in New York in June, 1958. Other honors are membership in the Academy of Japan and cultural medal given by the Emperor of Japan in 1949 and by the Asahi newspaper in 1955.

While a young man, Suzuki lived as a lay Buddhist disciple in Engakuji, Kamakura's great Zen monastery. After a strenuous period of diligent study and training, he had an awakening or satori which we shall discuss later. Because of his attainment of Zen Buddhism understanding, his master Soyen gave the Zen name of "Daisetz" which means "great serenity." Speaking of Suzuki as a personality, Sargeant wrote: "He radiates not only the general glamour that attaches to aging Oriental men of wisdom but a special serenity that makes him a magnificent living example of the doctrine he preaches."[22]

---

[22] New Yorker, August 31, 1957.

Suzuki does not have a logical systematic presentation of who man is. Neither does he propose to know the concept of selfhood in a systematic way where all statements made are objectively validated. The philosophical method of distinguishing a subject from the object, Suzuki maintains, is not the Zen approach to reality. Scientists, theologians and philosophers included, Suzuki observes, "forget the fact that a person invariably lives a personal life and not a conceptualized or scientifically defined and verified one. It is not the definition or concept the person live (though how exact the concept may be), but the life itself and it is this life which is not the question here."[23]

"'To know thyself'" is to know thy Self,"[24] Suzuki suggests. In the light of this suggestion, we can now proceed further, bearing in mind that this attempt on my part is just "indicating" or it is like a "finger pointing to the moon," and not the self or selfhood itself. Like Jesus of Nazareth who used parables, stories and common ordinary things of everyday living to illustrate a point, Suzuki employs tales, stories and anecdotes drawn both from the Chinese and Japanese Buddhist records of daily living.

---

[23] Suzuki, "Zen: A Reply to Hu Shih," in Philosophy East and West, Vol. III, No. 1, 25-46.

[24] Suzuki, et al., Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis.

SECTION I

THE SOUL OF MAN

The essence of Zen Buddhism is expressed in this gatha of four lines:

> A special transmission outside the
> doctrinal teaching
> No dependence upon words and letters;
> Direct pointing at the soul of man;
> Seeing into one's nature and the
> attainment of Buddhahood.[25]

There is man with a soul to which direct pointing needs to be made. Into his nature, Suzuki asserts, one must see in order to know man himself. But what is this soul of man and what is his own nature? What is it made up of? What can be found in man's own being?

Suzuki, who attempts to answer these questions logically, writes: "Zen in its essence is the art of seeing into the nature of one's being, and it points the way from bondage to freedom. By making us drink right from the fountain of life, it liberates us from all yokes under which we finite beings are usually suffering in this world."[26] Man has energies which are in ordinary circumstances cramped, Suzuki continues, but Zen liberates the same, "giving free play to all the creative and benevolent impulses inherently lying in our hearts." He possesses all the necessary faculties that will make people happy and loving towards one another, but he is too ego-centered, carrying this ego-shell all the time from childhood up to the time he passes away. He is, however, given many chances to break through this shell. The first and greatest of them is adolescence, Suzuki asserts, for this is the first time the ego really comes to recognize the "other". "An ego, entire and undivided, now begins to feel a sort of split in itself." And it is, Suzuki explains, through the awakening of love that "we get a glimpse into the infinity of things, and that this glimpse urges youth to Romanticism or the Rationalism according to his temperament and environment and education."[27]

---

[25] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, 1, p. 176.

[26] Ibid., p. 13.

Man's body is "something like an electric battery in which a mysterious power latently lies." This power can break the ego-shell and the "other" is taken into its own body. When this happens, Suzuki points out, "the ego has denied itself or that the ego has taken its first steps towards the infinite."[28] There comes an intense struggle between the finite and the infinite, between the intellect and a higher power, between the flesh and the spirit. Zen comes to help man solve this "problem of problems" and to face this inner conflict and struggle by suggesting to open a "third eye" to a new world hitherto unperceived in the confusion of a dualistically trained mind. Books are important; lectures can be of help. Sermons may be inspiring, and various religious exercises may be instructive. On the other hand, Zen without depreciating the usefulness of doctrinal teaching and methods has a way of "opening the mind-flower". And when this "brightening up of the mind-works" takes place, man's entire surroundings are viewed from quite an unexpected angle of perception. All the world's opposites and contradictions are united and harmonized into a consistent whole.

---

[27] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, 1, p. 13.

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 13 f.

Zen Buddhists, aware of their Indian historical origins as well as the Chinese practical interpretation of the doctrine of Enlightenment, find telling insights into Sakyamuni's way of transmitting his message. Suzuki records thus:

> Sakyamuni was once engaged at the Mount of the Holy Vulture in preaching to a congregation of his disciples. He did not resort to any lengthy verbal discourses to explain his point, but simply lifted a bouquet of flowers before the assemblage, which was presented to him by one of his lay-disciples. Not a word came out of his mouth. Nobody understood the meaning of this except the old venerable Mahakasyapa, who quietly smiled at the master, as if he fully comprehended the purpose of this silent but eloquent teaching on the part of the Enlightened One. The latter perceiving this opened his gold-tongued mouth and proclaimed solemnly, 'I have the most precious treasure, spiritual and transcendental, which this moment I hand over to you,

O venerable Mahakashyapa'.[29]

Suzuki points out that the Enlightenment of Buddha is the most significant, essential and fruitful part of Buddhism.[30] This Doctrine of Enlightenment, both philosophically and from Zen point of view, Suzuki argues, is what the Buddha really wished to impart to his disciples. True, the achievement of Buddhahood was the ultimate goal of his teaching, but Buddha was practical and always close to the daily facts of life. He regarded life as something to be regulated by moral rules, and the Eightfold Path of Righteousness was an ethical guide to Enlightenment.[31] His emphasis was on the significance of self-realization, for Nirvana or Enlightenment or Satori was to be attained personally through one's own efforts in one's inner consciousness.

The account of Mahakashyapa transmitting the Eye which looks into the deeps of the Dharma, to his successor, Ananda, supports Zen's way of special transmission outside of Buddha's doctrinal teaching:

---

[29] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, 1, p. 167.

[30] The Fourfold Noble Truth or the Twelve-fold chain of causation was an intellectual direction to the realization of the Buddhist life. Yet, Buddha did not have the desire to disclose intellectually or metaphysically the content of Enlightenment which he believed must be experienced; it can never be explained fully. Ibid., p. 167.

[31] Ibid., p. 163.

> Ananda asked Kashyapa: 'What was it that thou has received from Buddha besides the robe and the bowl?' Kashyapa called: 'O Ananda.' Ananda replied: 'Yes'. Thereupon Kashyapa said, "Wilt thou take down the flagpole at the gate?" Upon receiving this order, a spiritual illumination came over the mind of Ananda, and the 'Seal of Spirit' was handed over by Mahakashyapa to this junior disciple.[32]

Bodhidarma (or Dharma), the 28th patriarch in India who successfully received the Seal from Buddha was the first in China.[33] One of the questions which Emperor Wu of Liang Dynasty asked him was: "What is considered by your reverence to be the first principles of the Holy Doctrine?" Dharma's answer, which the Emperor could not understand, was "Vast emptiness and nothing holy therein."[34] Confused, Emperor Wu inquired again: "Who is he, then, that now confronts me?" Dharma, an apostle of mysticism who was never fascinated by scholastic discussion, retorted: "I know not, Your Majesty."[35]

Dharma, in answer to Shen's frantic quest for the pacification of his soul, retorted: "Where is your soul? Bring it out before me, and I shall have it pacified." Shen

---

[32] Suzuki, _Studies in Zen_, p. 13.

[33] The third son of the Kind of Hsian-chin in Southern India, Dharma became a monk and studied Buddhism under Prajnatara for forty years. In obedience to Prajnatar's instruction, he sailed for China and landed at Kuang-chou in Southern China in the year 520.

[34] Suzuki, _Studies in Zen_, p. 14.

[35] _Ibid_.

Kuang sighed: "The very reason of my trouble is that I am unable to find the soul."[36] Whereupon Dharma exclaimed: "There, I have pacified your soul." And Shen Kuang suddenly attained spiritual illumination which wiped out all his doubts and put an end to all his searchings.

Hui-neng (died 713) whose life and succession to the religious authority of Hungjen[37] presents a very telling, human story, succinctly states his deep religious intuition:

> Bodhi has from the first nothing to do
> with the tree,
> The bright mirror has also no stand on
> which to place itself.
> The Buddha-nature is eternally illuminating,
> And where could dust ever accumulate?[38]

Ming, another monk who frantically pursued Hui-neng, halted, hesitated and trembled with awe, falteringly implored: "I come here to obtain the faith and not the robe.

---

[36] A former Confucian scholar, Shen's Buddhist name is Hui-k'o (485-593) and he was the second patriarch of the Zen sect in China.

[37] Following Seng Ts'an (died 606), Tao-hsin (died 650) and Jung-jen (602-75) who were the third, fourth, and fifth patriarchs respectively, was Hui-neng or Eno (died 713), a great religious genius whose life marks an epoch in the history of the Zen sect. He laid a firm basis for the idea that the Buddhist life consists in awakening prajna-intuition which will be discussed later.

[38] Hilary Conroy in his review of Suzuki's _An Introduction to Zen Buddhism_, calls our attention to the oldest manuscript of the platform sutra which was discovered at Tun-huang in 1900. The manuscript has an entirely different reading of the line, and may be rendered: "The Buddha-nature is always pure." _Journal of Asian Studies_, Vol. XXIV, 3, May 1965, 517.

O my brother monk pray dispel my ignorance." Hui-neng replied: "If thou comest for the faith, stop all thy hankerings. Thinkest thou not of good, thinkest thou not of evil, and see what at this moment thy own face doth look like, which thou hadst even prior to thy birth?" At once, Ming perceived the fundamental reason of things, and inquired further: "Beside this hidden sense as embodied in those significant words, is there any other thing which is secret?" The patriarch responded: "In what I have shown to thee there is nothing hidden. If thou reflectest within thyself and recognizest thine own face, which as before the world, secrecy is in thyself."[39]

To the question, what is Zen?[40] one may refer to Hui-neng who expressed clearly Zen faith. But in a deeper sense, Zen scholars find it a very hazardous and hard task to present it logically. One Chinese expression may help in capturing for us the essence: "Something round and rolling, slippery and slick something ungraspable and indescribable, which cannot be explained or interpreted." Hui-neng's advice to Ming mentioned above may be appropriate, which may be said in the Christian text; as follows: If you reflect within yourself and recognize your own face, which was before the world, "the kingdom of God is in you."

---

[39] Suzuki, Studies in Zen, p. 18.

[40] The word "Zen" is the Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese word "Ch'an", and "ch'an" is the abbreviation of the original phrase "Ch'an-Na" -- a corruption of the pronunciation of the Sanskrit word Dhyana or the Pali Jhana meaning meditation. See also Suzuki's review of Dumoulin's A History of Zen Buddhism in The Eastern Buddhist, Vol. 1, No. 1, September 1965, 123, where he argues that the native Chinese meaning for the ideogram Ch'an has nothing to do with the doctrine which we shall discuss in the following pages.

SECTION II

FREEDOM TO BE ORIGINAL

The ultimate authority of Zen Faith is within one's self. One must directly and personally experience Zen in his inner spirit. "Just as two stainless mirrors reflect each other," Suzuki maintains, "the fact and our own spirits must stand facing each other with no intervening agents. When this is done we are able to seize upon the living, pulsating fact itself."[41]

In the "Flower Sermon of Buddha" which we referred earlier, we saw how the special transmission was done. Again recall to mind how Ananda received the Seal of Spirit. Zen masters remain silent or utter incoherent sounds, or make a physical show of force or engage in other forms of communication other than words. They do not rely on sutras or abhidharmas, however exalted and enlightened the authors of these sacred books are. These religious texts and notes are useful insofar as they indicate the direction where man's spiritual efforts are to be applied. Zen deals not with concepts, doctrines and theories, but with living facts of life and personal experience.

---

[41] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism, ..., p. 13.

A short dialogue admirably sums up this point and its relevant, significant overtones. Dharma, thinking that his time to return to his native country had come, gathered his disciples with these words: "The time is coming and why do you not tell me what each of you has attained?"

Dofuku (Tao-fu) a disciple answered: "According to my insight, the Tao operates neither depending upon letters nor separate from them." Dharma said: "You have my skin."

Soji (Tsung-ch'ih) uttered: "according to my understanding, it is Ananda's seeing the land of Akshobhya-Buddha: it is seen once and never seen twice." Dharma remarked: "You have my flesh."

Koiku (Tao-yu) remarked: "The four elements are from the first empty and the five aggregates (skandhas) are non-existent. According to my view there is not one object which is said to be attainable." Dharma commented: "You have my bones."

At last Yeka (Hui-K'o) blurted out making his bow and taking his place. Dharma then declared: "You have my marrow."

Zen disciples are encouraged to be original and independent as possible not only in their interpretation of traditional Buddhism but also in their ways of thinking.

Blind acceptance of an outside authority and meek submission to conventionality have no place. Zen masters want life, individuality and inspiration in each of their disciples. They advocate perfect freedom to the self-unfolding of the Mind within oneself. Listen to what Doshin, the fourth patriarch, has to say:

> No invoking the Buddha's nature, no trying to seize upon the mind, no contemplation on the mind, no deliberation, no speculation, no concentration no scattering of thought; only let things flow on as they would, neither let them pass away, nor let them stay on; be one; be alone, clean of all appendages, and ultimately the mind will all by itself be clear and unspoiled.[42]

This state of mind finds echoes in Hui-neng's suggestion to realize "no-mind", "no-form", and "no-abiding", and he advises further "to keep Tao (i.e. *prajna*) ever flowing with no obstructions." This keeping the stream of consciousness in a state of constant flowing with any kind of interruption or barrier, internal or external, is the working of *prajna* and the ultimate goal of Zen discipline.

Prajna-*Dhyana*: Looking Intuitively

As contrasted to the general translation of *Dhyana* which is meditation or a concentrated state of consciousness, Hui-neng's definition of *dhyana* (tso-ch'an) is not to cling to mind; it is not to cling to purity, nor is it to concern itself with permanence. In other words: dhyana is "not to have any thought stirred up by the outside conditions of life, good and bad -- this is tsa (dhyana). To see inwardly the immovability of one's self-nature -- this is ch'an (dhyana). ... Outwardly, to be free from the notion of form -- this is ch'an. Inwardly, not to be disturbed -- this is ting (dhyana)."[43]

---

[42] Suzuki, *Zen and Japanese Buddhism*, p. 24.

Prajna[44] in Sanskrit, and transcribed in Chinese as pan-jou and in Japanese as hannha, is a power, the highest form of intuition man has in possession. By the exercise of prajna-intution, man attains what is known as bodhi in Sanskrit, puti in Chinese, or bodai in Japanese. "Prajna is not mere knowledge dealing with relative objects; it is knowledge of the highest order permitted to the human mind, for it is the spark of the ultimate constituent of all things. Bodhi, or more fully, sambodhi, which we will discuss later, is "the supreme enlightenment" which was achieved by Gautama when he was sitting cross-legged under the bodhi-tree by the river Nairanjana in the northern part of India about 25 centuries ago.

---

[43] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism, Collected writings, ed. by W. Barrett, p. 167.

[44] Essays in East-West Philosophy, University of Hawaii Press, 1951, has Suzuki's philosophy article on "Reason and Intuition in Buddhist Philosophy" which discusses quite extensively the Prajna (Intuition) and vijnana (discussive reason). See also Genryu Tsutsumi, "Karuna and Prajna," Japanese Religions, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 45-49.

Using the terminology of Chinese philosophy, Suzuki through the eyes of Hui-neng explains the importance of prajna when he referred to hsing. Hsing is something ultimate in the being of a thing or a person, though it must not be concerned as an individual entity, "like a kernel or nucleus which is left when all the outer casings are removed, or like a soul which escapes from the body after death." There is no existence without hsing, for as its morphological construction indicates, hsing is a "heart or mind which lives" within man. Figuratively, it may be designated as vital force. Hui-neng describes thus: "the hsin (mind or heart) is the dominion, hsing is the lord: the lord rules over his dominion, there is hsing, and there is the lord; hsing departs, and the lord is no more; hsing is and the body and the mind (hsin) subsists, hsing is not and the body and mind is destroyed. The Buddha is to be made within hsing and not to be sought outside the body..."[45]

Hui-neng is careful to point out that hsing is the dominating force over man's entire being; it is the principle of vitality, physical and spiritual. When hsing is no more, all is dead, though he explains, this does not mean that hsing is something apart from the body and mind, which enters into it to actuate it, and departs at the time of death. This hsing is not a logical a priori but an actuality which can be experienced. Hui-neng designates it as tzu-hsing or self-nature or self-being.

---

[45] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism, p. 173.

Self-nature is self-knowledge; it is not mere being but knowing. "We can say that because of knowing itself, it is; knowing is being, and being is knowing," Suzuki writes. This is what Hui-neng meant when he said: "In original Nature itself there is Prajna-knowledge, and because of this self-knowledge Nature reflects itself in itself, which is self-illumination not to be expressed in words."

In his article: "Zen: A reply to Dr. Shih"[46] Suzuki clearly pointed out Hui-neng's revolutionary message: the identity doctrine, i.e. dhyana and prajna are one. As opposed to the early teaching on the separation of dhyana and prajna, Hui-neng illustrates the idea of this oneness by the relation of the lamp and its light. Suzuki quotes Hui-neng: "it is like the lamp and its light. As there is a lamp, there is light; if no lamp, no light. The lamp is the Body of the light, and the light is the Use of the lamp. They are differently designated, but in substance they are one. The relation between Dhyana and Prajna is to be understood in like manner."[47]

Suzuki illustrates this identity doctrine by using Shen-hui's discussion with Ch'eng, the Zen master. Shen-hui remarked to Wang Wei, who was the host: "When I am thus talking with you I am the identity of dhyana and prajna." Ma-tsu's famous dictum is more illuminating: "My everyday thought is the Tao." By this he meant: "Everyday thought means to be doing nothing special; it means to be free from right and wrong, to be free from taking and giving up, to be free from nihilism as well as eternalism, to be neither a saintly nor an ordinary man, neither a wise man nor a bodhisattva. My going-about, standing, sitting, or lying-down; my meeting situations as they arise; my dealing with things as they come and go -- all this is the Tao."[48]

---

[46] Suzuki, "Zen: A Reply to Hu Shih," Philosophy East and West, Vol. III, No. 1, April, 1953; Suzuki, Studies in Zen, p. 139.

[47] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism, p. 179.

The story of Kei-shin of Choska, a disciple of Nansen Fugwan, is another telling example of this identity doctrine. A monk interrogated Kei-shin on the meaning of "everyday thought." The latter replied: "If you want to sleep, sleep; if you want to sit, sit." "I do not understand," complained the monk. Kei-shin answered: "When hot, we try to get cool; when cold, we turn toward a fire."[49]

In short, prajna-intuition as distinguished from perceptual intuition or object-subject way of looking at things, is direct and immediate. It is not analytical but integrating, not cognitive but merely expressive. There is one quality in this kind of intuitive knowledge, Suzuki underscores: "The uniqueness of prajna-intuition consists in its authoritativeness, utterly convincing and contributive to the feeling that 'I am the ultimate reality itself,' that 'I am absolute knower; that I am free and know no fear of any kind."[50]

---

[48] Tao Yuan, Ching Te Ch'uan Ting Lu (The Record of the Transmission of the Lamp). Fas XXVIII, quoted in Suzuki, Studies in Zen, p. 140.

[49] Suzuki, Studies in Zen, p. 140.

The characterizations of prajna-intuition, which is no other than the Zen-experience, showing the masters' method of handling Zen questions, may be illustrated by examples. Dogo inquired of Sekito, "What is the ultimate Buddhist teaching?" Sekito's reply was: "Unless you have it you cannot tell." Dogo asked further: "Is there anything further which may give me a clue?" Sekito remarked: "The vastness of the sky does not hinder the white cloud flying anywhere it likes."

On another occasion, Dogo demanded: "Who has attained the teaching of the Sixth Patriarch?" Sekito responded: "One who has understood Buddhism has it." Then Dogo asked: "Do you have it?" Sekito's retort was: "No, I do not understand Buddhism."

Zen Methods of Discipline

There are various ways of looking at things from a new point of view. The Zen masters do not have stereotyped methods of instructing their disciples. Suzuki classifies two methods,[51] namely verbal and direct. While the first heading includes paradox, going beyond opposites, contradiction, affirmation, repetition and exclamation; the seond heading shows display of physical force such as gesture, striking, performance of a definite set of acts, etc. The idea of the direct method used by the masters is to capture the fleeting life as it passes by, and not after it has flown. During the 'fleeing' there is no time to conceptualize ideas or to philosophize with traditional language. And the things involved in the "direct method" are found everywhere. This direct method is not all the time the violent assertion of life-force but a graceful movement of the body, the giving of a glass of milk of a mother to a child, listening to the cricket, the answering to the telephone or any one of our most daily activities of life.

---

[50] Suzuki, Studies in Zen, p. 147.

Suzuki, in an effort to explain the practical method of instruction, sums this point up:

> Zen does this by giving one a new point of view of looking at things, a new way of appreciating the truth and beauty of life and world, by discovering a new source of energy in the inmost recesses of consciousness, and by bestowing on one a feeling of completeness and sufficiency. That is to say, Zen works miracles by overhauling the whole system of one's inner life and opening up a world hitherto entirely undreamt of.[52]

---

[51] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, 1, p. 271.

[52] Ibid., p. 27.

Let us give some instances: A monk inquired from Tozan on "Who is Buddha?" The master answered: "Three pounds of flax."[53] Seihei (Tsing-ping, 845-919) asked Suibi (T'sui-wei):[54] "What is the fundamental principle of Buddhism?" "Wait," requested Suibi; "when there is no one around I will tell you."

Entering the garden, Seihei repeated the request: "There is nobody here now; pray enlighten me."

Descending from his chair, Suibi took the earnest interrogator into the bamboo grove, but said nothing. When the latter pressed for a response, Suibi whispered: "How high these bamboos are! And how short those over there!"

Koan[55] (Kung-an in Chinese), originally a public document, a kind of problem-solving, is one of the famous means of helping disciples attain spiritual illumination. Parables, astounding irrelevant statements or questions are used. The following are some illustrative examples:

A monk asked Chao-chou, "What is the meaning of the First Patriarch's visit to China?" "The cypress tree in the front courtyard."

When Chao-chou went to study Zen under Nan-ch'uan, he inquired, "What is the Tao (or the Way)?" The latter answered: "Your everyday mind, that is the Tao."

---

[53] Suzuki, Studies in Zen, p. 27.

[54] The Transmission of the Lamp (Chuan-teng Lu), Vol. XV, quoted in Suzuki's An Introduction to Zen Buddhism, p. 73.

[55] Suzuki, Essays ..., II, p. 15-186.

"When not a thought is stirring in one's mind, is there any error here?" Yen-men answered: "as much as Mount Sumeru." Actually, the koan is, explains Suzuki, within man, and what the Zen master does is no more than to point it out for man so that he can see it more plainly than before. The master's efforts are directed to bring man in relation with Being or Life which animates all things and feel its pulsation, as when the eye comes in touch with light it recognizes it as light.

A Zen monk is encouraged to practice what is called meditation known as zazen.[56] He sits silently, his position is the lotus posture, eyes half-opened, his gaze falls unfocused to the floor, sitting for hours, for days or weeks to develop his intuitive powers, and tries to relate such discoveries to the immediacy of his daily life. Humphreys, commenting on the valuable writings of Suzuki, Nyogen Senzaki as helpful guides from Zen meditation and training, suggests that all of one's study must be directed to actual experience, and his self-training must be planned accordingly. One of the purposes of meditation must be, he argues, to calm the mind and reduce to a minimum the distraction of ideas. Kapleau, in his book The Three Pillars of Zen,[57] describes fully what sesshin is. Going back to the time of the Buddha in one form or another, sesshin is a mode of spiritual discipline whose counterpart can be found nowhere in Buddhism except Zen. Monks would train themselves in seclusion during the several months of the rainy season, and their purpose was "to enable one to collect and unify his normally scattered mind so that he can focus it like a powerful telescope inward in order to discover his true Self-nature." Many basic teaching devices and methods of Zen like zazen, teisho (the formal lecture) and dokusan[58] (private instruction) are coordinated into a meaningful whole during sevem days of seclusion.

---

[56] Rashi, Shibayama, "The Language of Zazen, "Zazen Wasen," Journal, Blaisdell Institute, Vol. II, 2, June 1967, 9-11. See also Kapleau, The Three Pillars of Zen, where the author illustrates graphically Zazen pictures, pp. 315-32. See p. 46 for the arms of zazen.

At the same time, he is kept fully occupied with all kinds of manual work, sweeping, washing, cooking, etc. Along with the masters who share in the general work of the monastery, he uses both mind and body in his Zen training. In the workaday routine, one may frequently be surprised by a master's touch and question: "What is it that you are carrying along?" or "I hear your voice but where is your being?" Indeed there is no artificial gradation among Zen masters and disciples. They work regardless of age, position. Master Hyakujo (Pai-chang Huai-hai 720-814), emphasizing the importance of manual work in Zen training and Zen way of living, aptly summarized it: "A day of no work is a day of no eating."[59]

---

[57] Kapleau, ed., The Three Pillars of Zen (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), pp. 192-204.

[58] Dokusan: a private meeting with roshi in his teaching chamber. The general term for a formal appearance before the roshi is sanzen. There are three types of sanzen: sosan, or listening to the roshi's general lectures on Zen practice, usually in a group-compulsory for all beginning; dokusan, or going singly before the roshi at given periods -- optional; naisan, or visiting the roshi "secretly" at any time, day or night, when special circumstances warrant it. At Yatsutami-roshi's sesshin, dokusan takes place three times daily at 5 a.m., 3 p.m. and 7 p.m.

Dramatizing the importance and functional role of mondo (question and answer) in particular, and the non-logical characteristic of Zen Buddhism in general, Nakamura[60] succinctly explains:

> Since no semantic connection between the questions and the answers was required, the answers can be of infinite variety. The question and the answer are given in a moment. There is no sustained development such as characterises Greek dialogue. The answers seem strange indeed, but it is said that many of those who heard the answers gained enlightenment. Zen masters never answered questions in the form of universal propositions. They believed the philosophical problems could be best solved by evoking intuition. They gave answers in a figurative and intuitive way.

---

[59] Zenkei Shibayama, A Flower Does not Talk, p. lv, quoted by Suzuki in his introduction.

[60] Hajime Nakamura, Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples: India, China, Tibet, Japan, rev. trans. ed. by P. Wiener (Hawaii: East-West Center Press, 1964), pp. 194-95.

No-Mind: Being An Artist of Life

The word "no-mind" or Mind (captialized) has been mentioned many times, and it is now time to describe what it is. Hui-neng's (Eno or Wei-lang's) no-mind or mushin is attained by the awakening of prajna-intuition.[61] Its psychological equivalent is Emptiness which is a metaphysical term. Zen followers identify the Emptiness with the Mind or the Nature (or the Buddha-nature); it is absolute Emptiness, Sunyata; it is absolute Suchness, Tathata. Thus "directly pointing at the Mind" means taking hold of it by means of prajna-intuition, though there is, Suzuki is very careful to point out, nothing really to hold as "Mind", a designated entity.

Suzuki, interpreting the Zen Unconscious, points out that Prajna or Self-nature functions in a two-fold direction. One is toward the Unconscious or Mind or no-mind which is Prajna properly so-called; the other is toward the conscious or the prajna of the consciousness or mind (with small m).[62]

This no-mind or Unconscious is different from the unconscious of the psychologists. The psychologist's unconscious is part of consciousness, while no-mind belongs completely to a different category. "No-mind is what makes up both the conscious and the unconscious, it is in them, with them, but it is more than both of them; it is more fundamental."[63] It is because of this that the no-mind is an indefinite reservoir of possibilities and potentialities. Man's consciousness gains, when no-mind is tapped, power and unlimited possibilities in countless ways, aesthetically, intellectually, emotionally, and ethically are released.

---

[61] Suzuki, Zen and Japanese Buddhism, p. 27.

[62] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism, ..., pp. 211-20.

The story of an artist and dragon[64] may illuminate our understanding of the No-mind or Unconscious. An abbot asked a famous painter to have the ceiling of the Dharma Hall decorated with a dragon. When the painter who accepted the task complained that he had not seen a real dragon, the abbot suggested: "Don't mind your not having seen the creature. You become one, you be transformed into a living dragon and paint it. Don't try to follow the conventional pattern."

Still not sure of the instruction, the artist asked: "How can I become a dragon?" The abbot kindly responded: "You retire to your private room and concentrate your mind on it. The time will come when you feel that you must paint one. That is the moment when you have become the dragon, and the dragon urges you to give it a form."

Several months of struggles and striving passed but the artist continuously followed the abbot's suggestion until he saw himself in the dragon out of his no-mind or Unconscious. Suzuki reports that one can see now on the ceiling of the Dharma Hall at the Myoshinji, Kyoto, a dragon.

---

[63] Suzuki, Zen and Japanese Buddhism, p. 22.

[64] Suzuki, et al., ed., Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 13.

Not all of us can be scientists who can analytically describe an object and critically verify the different elements. But certainly, Suzuki observes, each of us can be an artist who can get into the thing and feel it inwardly and live its life himself. "We are all born artists, creative artists of life, and each must realize this basic truth."

An artist of life does not need to go out of himself. Unlike a sculptor who uses stone or iron, etc., in order to express himself or impress his ideas on the material, an artist of life has all the material, all the implements that are ordinarily necessary which have been with him from the time of his birth. "The body, the physical body we all have," Suzuki explains, "is the material, corresponding to the painter's canvas, the sculptor's wood or the stone, the musician's violin ... or the singer's vocal cords. And everything that is attached to the body, such as hands, the nerves ... thoughts, feelings, everything, indeed that goes to make up the whole personality -- is both the material on which and the instruments with which the person molds his creative genius into conduct, into behavior, into all forms of action, indeed into life itself."[65] An artist of life creates out of his inexhaustive source of the Unconscious, and his life reflects such images. His every deed shows originality, creativity, his dynamic personality. No crippling past prevents him from facing its new day with its challenges and opportunities. No inhibitory motivation deters him from doing what is right today. Spontaneously responding to the here and now of its new day, he confronts each new happening without minding what others have done before. Like the wind that blows where it lists, he behaves freely. No longer imprisoned in a fragmentary, controlled, ego-centric existence, he lives and loves and laughs wholeheartedly. T'ang, a great Zen master, portrays this true artist of life whom he said: "with a man who is master of himself wherever he may be found he behaves truly to himself."

An artist of life has a sense of unity with all things and his activity is in order and harmony. Chuang-tzu's picture of a perfect man may fit the description of an artist when he said: "the perfect man as living when time has not yet come to existence," "abiding with the reason of endlessness," "attaining the formless of things," "in unison with Heaven." "This perfect man," Suzuki through Chuang-tzu's writings points out, "holds his nature in complete unity, nourishes his energy (*ch'i*) in full vigor, keeps all his activity in harmony, and thereby is in communion with the creator of things. He is thus perfect in guarding his Heaven and he preserves his spirit in absolute integrity so as not to allow any external object to disturb it."[66]

---

[65] Suzuki, et al., ed., Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, pp. 17-18.

A story is told of Li Po (701-62), a great poet of the T'ang dynasty, who like Edgar Allen Poe, drank heavily. And he did so especially when he wanted to write fine poetical lines and compositions. Apparently this intoxicating substance freed him from all kinds of inhibitory, lecherous entanglements. Li Po, like most modern men and women, kept on setting up defenses and building monuments of security, observes Suzuki, "When the obstructions are removed, the unconscious is freer to function and the artist feels at ease to display whatever 'heavenliness' he has within him."[67]

The "perfect man" is not like an artist who depends on external agents such as canvass and all sound-producing gadgets. There is no need for these things because "he is at home in his own body, which is always ready to turn into the most efficient instruments for the execution of Heaven that is hidden within himself." Each man is endowed by Nature a form which one can shape in his own individual style -- lovable or unlovable, fascinating or repulsive, responsive or careless. Chuang-tzu's terse statement recapitulates this point: "When the heavenliness of Heaven attains its original integrity or sincerity one is a 'perfect man' who has no fears whatever, walking over and through the ten thousand things."[68] In another saying characteristic of Chuang-tzu: "the perfect man treats things as things and is not thinged by things." He moves around and always takes a stroll in the Field of Fullness (the Buddhist's term is emptiness) with the Ancestor of thousands of things.

---

[66] Suzuki, *Zen* ..., p. 54.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

Suzuki calls our attention to the fact that this state of mind of the perfect man is not to be equated with a state of mere concentration. The former is the result of one's delving and being in harmonious accord with the essence of all things. This perfect man has a deeper insight into the formlessness of things. In other words, he has satori-awakening. The awakened one is in "these moments of no time."[69]

Satori: Becoming Awakened

This acquiring of a new point of view in man's relations with men, life and world is called satori or wu in

---

[68] Suzuki, Zen ..., p. 58.

[69] C. Humphreys, "Some Observations on Zen Buddhism for the West," The Eastern Buddhist, Vol. 1, 2, September 1966, 78-83.

Chinese. It is another name for Enlightenment (annuttara-samyak-sambodhi). Satori, Suzuki writes,[70] may be defined:

> as an intuitive looking into the nature of things in contradistinction to the analytical or logical understanding of it. Practically, it means the unfolding of a new world hitherto unperceived in the confusion of a dualistically trained mind. Or we may say that with satori our entire surroundings are viewed from a quite unexpected angle of perception. Whatever this is, the world for those who have gained a satori is no more the world as it used to be; even with all its flowing streams and burning fires, it is never the same one again. Logically stated, all its opposites and contradictions are united and harmonized into a consistent organic whole. This is a mystery and a miracle, but according to Zen masters such is being performed every day. Satori can thus be had only through our once personally experiencing it.

Suzuki warns us that there are many simulacra of satori, but if the satori is genuine, "its effects on one's moral and spiritual life are revolutionary, and they are so enhancing, purifying as well as exacting." Poetically expressed, satori is the "brightening up of the mind-works," or the opening of the mind-flower, or "the removing of the bar." A new vista opens before man, limitless in expanse and reaching the end of time. There is a feeling of freedom in life's activity when man gains satori-awakening, and life now enjoys itself to the fullest extent of its possibilities. There is in man the so-called "vacuity of interest and poverty of purpose." Without denying ethical values or transcending them, he has an inner state of consciousness. Man with this complete revolution produced by spiritual experience, is born anew. When one is awaken, Nishitani explains, he becomes aware of man's original and authentic nature (our dharma-nature) and lives in conformity to it. "The possibility of attaining this enlightenment depends," Nishitani continues, "entirely upon ourselves; the ability to attain it lies buried deep in the dharma nature of each of us."[71] Let us give some examples of Zen masters who had this illumination.

---

[70] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, 1, p. 230.

Kyogen (Hsium-yen), who is known as a remarkable and intelligent disciple of Hyakuyo, could not find a suitable passage to support his answer on the reason of birth and death. Discouraged, he asked Yisan (We-shan, 771-853) to instruct him in the faith of Zen; the latter answered him: "I really have nothing to impart to you, and if I tried to do so you may have an occasion to make me an object of ridicule later on. Besides, whatever I can instruct is my own and will never be yours." Frustrated and forsaken by an unkind Zen disciple, Kyogen decided to burn up all his notes and memorandum since they were of no use in his search for spiritual well-being. Retiring to have solitude and simplicity in accordance with Buddhist rules, he built a hut near the tomb of Chu (Hui-chung) the National Master at

---

[71] Keji Nishitani, "The Awakening of Self in Buddhism," The Eastern Buddhist, Vol. 1, No. 2, September 1966, 3.

Nan-yang, without any desire to master Buddhism "so difficult to comprehend and too subtle to receive instruction from another." One morning while he was weeding and sweeping the ground, a piece of rock brushed away struck a bamboo. The sound suddenly brought him to a state of satori: Yisan's question resolved itself, his joy was unlimited, and he felt gratitude for Yisan's kind refusal to instruct him. This would not have happened to him if Yisan had explained things for him. Kyogen, after attaining this awakenness, wrote these lines which presents an idea of his satori:

> One stroke has made me forget all my previous
> knowledge,
> No artificial discipline is at all needed;
> In every movement I uphold the ancient way,
> And never fall into the rut of mere quietism
> Wherever I walk no traces are left,
> And my sense are not fettered by rules of conduct
> Everywhere those who have attained to the truth
> All declare this to be of the highest order.[72]

In order to have satori, one has to do it by himself without another's help. All that Zen masters can do is to indicate the way and leave the rest to one's own experience. "Just as the flower blooms out of its inner necessity, the looking into one's own nature must be the outcome of one's inner overflowing."

The opportunity of opening the "third eye" to the truth of Zen is found everywhere. One can awaken his inner sense in the observation of a flower blooming, or listening to a remark (intelligent or unintelligent), in the hearing of an inarticulate whisper or in the jumping of a frog in the pond, or in the facing of any trivial daily incident such as blowing a candle or sharpening a pencil. Suzuki's reminder is just timely: "You have now found yourself; from the very beginning nothing has been kept away from you. It was yourself that closed the eye to the fact. In Zen there is nothing to explain, nothing to teach, that will add to your knowledge. Unless it grows out of yourself, no knowledge is really of value to you, a borrowed plumage never grows."[73]

---

[72] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, I, p. 242.

Again, Humphreys who underscores the value of meditation before and after the attainment of this sudden "moment" of high awareness, describes what happens . . . "the duality of thought is 'suddenly' transcended, seeker and object fused in one, self for that moment ceases to be, and a radiance of 'foolish' joy illumines all one's being, never to be entirely lost in the days to come."[74]

This line of Hoyen (Fa-yen) of Gosozan which he composed when his mental eye was first opened may show the affirmation of life:

---

[73] Suzuki, Essays ..., 1, p. 245.

[74] Humphreys, "Some Observations in Zen Buddhism for the West," The Eastern Buddhist, Vol. 1, 2, September 1966, 83.

A patch of farm land quietly lies by the hill
Crossing my hands over the chest I ask the
old farmer kindly:
"How often have you sold it and bought it
back by yourself?"
I like the pines and bamboos that invite a
refreshing breeze.[75]

Zen is Suchness -- a grand affirmation similar to D. Hammarskjold's "Yes" to something.

Where does satori begin in the wide range of human "experiences?" What kind of experiences must one have in order to attain Satori? Suzuki, in an interview with Steiniber-Oberlin indicates some rays of light on these questions: "To merit the name of satori, the inner revolution must be sufficiently complete for the subject to be really and sincerely conscious that a true baptism has taken place in his mind. The intensity of the sensation is in ratio to the effort by the candidate to satori. For there are different degrees of intensity ... the possessor of a mild satori will not experience the same spiritual revolution as a Rinsai or a Bukko for instance. Zen is an affair of character, not of intelligence."[76]

Pratt may be able to explain this further when he mentioned the goal of Zen technique as something to jolt the mind out of its ordinary, closed rut and to give the soul such a bang that "its eyes will be knocked open and suddenly see the light of an utterly new world." "A process of 'incubation' within the subconscious is produced by several months or even years of zazen, meditation, study, training and 'atmosphere'. When the time is ripe and new insight will exfoliate suddenly from out the subconscious region if only it receives, so to speak, a last shake or stir."[77]

---

[75] Suzuki, Essays ..., 1, p. 249.

[76] Suzuki, The Buddhist Sects of Japan, pp. 155-56, quoted in Humphreys' Zen Buddhism, p. 165.

Can one detect whether one has attained satori? Or what does an awakened one do or have which is different from those unable to have this illumination? Humphreys notes that the qualities which dominate the mind after the satori awakening seem to include "certainty, serenity, clarity and a sense of rhythm, of being a part of the instrument of the wholeness of things," though these are very difficult to describe. The glorious feeling of serenity may be gleaned through this:

> Imperturbable and serene the ideal man
>   practices virtue,
> Self-possessed and dispassionate, he
>   commits no sin.
> Calm and silent he gives up seeing and
>   hearing.
> Even and upright his mind abides nowhere.[78]

---

[77] Pratt, The Pilgrimage of Buddhism, p. 632.

[78] Sutra of Wei Lang, p. 124.

In other words, one who has satori-awakening experiences something that is inexplicable and incommunicable. That which is experienced defies conceptualization. He "sees essence or nature" and this seeing and perceiving is "knowledge of the most adequate kind ... which cannot be expressed in words." The knowledge is concerned with something universal and at the same time with the individual aspect of existence. He with his intuitive insight has "knowledge of an individual object and also of that Reality which is at the back of it."

He who drinks the water knows whether it is warm or cold. He alone has to drink it in order for him to know such a fact. His knowledge is direct and personal, and what logic can do is just to explain or interpret this inner perception that takes place in the most interior part of man's consciousness.

To the question on whether one continues to have Zen training even after attaining satori, again Kapleau says: "and just as one must nurture a newly emerged seedling until maturity, so Zen training stresses the need to ripen an initial satori through subsequent koan practice and/or _shikan_-_taza_ until it thoroughly animates one's life. In short, to reach and function on the higher level consciousness brought about by this enlightenment one must continue to train himself to act in accordance with this perception of Truth. A little parable in one of the sutras points out this special relationship between satori and post-satori. In this parable, satori is compared to a youth who, like the prodigal son after years of struggle and lonely wandering in a distant place, suddenly discovers that his rich father had for many years donated him his fortune and wealth. "And to actually take possession of this treasure, which is rightly his, and become capable of handling it wisely is equated with post-satori zazen, that is, with broadening and deepening the initial enlightenment."[79]

Illuminated, man affirms and accepts all there is in life and living regardless of their moral values. No dualism of any sort prevails. There is no concern with human questions of right and wrong. Like the prodigal son in the New Testament, the enlightened one at the moment of his satori experience "has come home and is quietly resting." A Zen master appropriately says: "There is not a fragment of tile above my head, there is not an inch of earth beneath my feet."

Suzuki,[80] in answer to many questions concerning ethics, social existence, explains the tabular presentation of five "steps" known as go-i in Zen training. The last one of these _go-i_ (go means five, and i stands for "situation" or "rung") is _Ken-chu-to_ or settling in the Ken. In this

---

[79] _The Three Pillars of Zen_, pp. 190-91.

[80] Suzuki, et al., ed., _Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis_, p. 74.

"step" the Zen man attains his goal, that is, he has satori. He is working just as diligently as ever, working with his fellow beings. His daily activities and programs are the same, and what is changed is his subjectivity.[81] This Self-Nature or Subjectivity, Suzuki explains:

> is not a relative subjectivity in which the object stands as its antithesis, but the absolute subjectivity. When this is taken hold of, we become the witnesses of creation where all things come out of the Nothingness -- or Emptiness, to use Zen terminology. This point of Emptiness is the spot where Christians and Buddhists can shake hands and say Tat Tvam Asi (Thou art it). But Zen reminds us of the other side of this truth: We are One, and yet two. Herein is our "every-day-mindedness."

Hakuin, the founder of modern Rinzai Zen in Japan, captures the spirit of the Zen-man's involvement and commitment with his world:

By hiring that idiot-sage,
Let us work together to fill the
well with snow.[82]

Experiencing in connection with ordinary occurrences of daily life, the awakened one has no personal feelings. No thoughts or feelings as "the heavenly sweetness of Christ's excellent love, or flame of love between a lover and his object of admiration and love, are involved. What is there is an impersonal tone.

---

[81] Suzuki's review of Dumoulin's A History of Zen Buddhism in The Eastern Buddhist, Vol. 1, No. 1, 123-26.

[82] Suzuki, et al., ed., Zen Buddhism ..., p. 74.

The feeling of exaltation that one has at the abrupt, momentary experience of illumination is aptly described by a Zen master: "When you have satori you are able to reveal a palatial mansion made of precious stones on a single blade of grass; but when you have no satori, a palatial mansion itself is concealed behind a simple blade of grass."[83]

The ten stages of spiritual cow-herding[84] represent ten steps in the realization of one's true nature or selfhood. They are oblique and suggestive. In a nutshell, man finds his selfhood when, in the here and now of life with the wear and tear of things, he is illuminated -- a new-born man with a new view of life.

There is neither beginning of the world nor ending. He is existentially and personally involved in the highways and byways of living, for to him life is to be grasped in the midst of its flow. After attaining satori by himself and for himself, he tries to help others attain it.[85] With a "third eye" he is an artist of life who can declare:

---

[83] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism, ed. by Barrett, p. 108.

[84] Suzuki, Essays on Zen Buddhism, pp. 271-376. See also Shiboyama, Zenki, The Six Oxherding Pictures.

[85] Suzuki, et. al., ed., Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 74.

> there is no need for the miraculous power
> of the gods,
> for he touches, and lo! the dead trees
> come into full bloom.[86]

Joshu Jushin (778-897) was once interrogated by a monk, "What is my Self?" Joshu answered, "Have you finished the morning gruel?" "Yes, I have finished." Joshu then requested him, "If so, wash your bowl." Suzuki comments that in order to speak of the acting, the eating and washing, this person, this actor is to be taken hold of existentially.

The true person is the actor himself who does the acts and deeds. And this actor who is existentially living with the inner workings of his being can equally say what the Zen master at the time of his satori-awakening commented:

> Before I was enlightened the rivers were
> rivers
> And the mountains were mountains.
> When I began to be enlightened the rivers
> Were not rivers any more and the mountains
> were not mountains.
> Now since I am enlightened, the rivers are
> Rivers again and the mountains are mountains.[87]

"What is man? There is no such thing as 'individual', Suzuki answered, there is only this person or that, each with his own name."[88]

---

[86] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, 1, p. 376.

[87] Suzuki, et al., ed., Zen ..., p. 118.

[88] Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 5, 1964, during East-West Philosophers' Conference.

CHAPTER IV

IQBAL'S UNDERSTANDING OF SELFHOOD

Preliminary Remarks

> My being was an unfinished statue,
> Uncomely, worthless, good for nothing.
> Love chiselled me: I became a man
> and gained knowledge of the nature
> I have seen the movement of the sinew
> of the sky,
> And the blood coursing in the veins
> of the moon.[1]

These lines of poetic and philosophical insights open to us the door of Iqbal's abundant life and thoughts. These show how Iqbal thinks of himself and his relation to the world. The intellectual and spiritual pilgrimage of Iqbal, whose life and works made an impression in the Islamic world in general and in the historical landmarks of his country in particular, find traces in these lines. Arberry wrote:

> The twenty odd years which have elapsed since the death of Sir Muhammad Iqbal, scholar and statesman, advocate of Islamic unity and the creation of Pakistan, have served even to enlarge his reputation as an original thinker and a poet of genius. His works or rather parts of them, have been translated out of the original Urdu and Persian into Arabic, English, French, German and Italian; his writings

---

[1] Iqbal, M. The Secrets of the Self, tr. from Iqbal's Askar-i-Khirdi by Reynold A. Nicholson (New York: Macmillan, 1st publication, 1920), Verses 150-154.

> have been analyzed and his ideas expounded in hundreds of articles.[2]

Truly there is no Muslim author in modern times who has provoked so much discussion and challenged so many to accept the changing times and modes of life -- "a sure proof of the relevance and fertility of his concepts."

Born into a Punjabi bourgeois family in 1873, Muhammad Iqbal was an Indian Moslem who died in 1938. His emergence coincided with one of the most complicated and critical periods in Indian history,[3] and the intricacy as well as the confusion of his background and training is "reflected in the polyglot character of his work: the language he commonly spoke was Punjabi; the language of his shorter poems was

---

[2] A. J. Arberry, "Review" of S. Abdun Vahid's Iqbal, His Art and Thought, London, 1920, The Islamic Review, March-April 1960, 45-46.

[3] This is the time when the Muslim world had lost its political power. "Islamic culture and civilization had ceased to be a living force. He was brought up in a religious environment of the last decade of nineteenth century India. The West had attained supremacy in the political field as well as in the cultural sphere. Only twenty years before his birth, the fate of the Moghul Empires had been sealed in India. In other countries, European powers were equally successful, in subjugating the Muslim population. These successes naturally brought many important questions to the forefront. How have these Westerners succeeded in attaining this superiority? Is there anything wrong in our living and thinking? How can we regain our lost position? What is the significance of the new forces that have overwhelmed the Muslim world in so short a time? Again what is the cause of our decline, both politically and culturally? These questions led Iqbal to a deeper study of history." Dar, Bashir Admad Dax, Iqbal and Post-Kantian Voluntarism, p. 8.

Urdu, that of his long poems was Persian; whilst his philosophical works were written in English and his religious language was Arabic."[4]

Though to a certain extent, Iqbal was a man of his times, still he comes forward as an apostle, if not to his own age, then to posterity....

> I have no need of the ear of Today
> I am the voice of the poet of Tomorrow[5]

In a Persian way he invoked the Saki to fill his cup with wine and pour moonbeams into the 'dim vast vale' of this thought,

> That I may lead home the wanderer,
> And imbue the idle looker-on with
>   restless impatience,
> And advance hotly on a new quest,
> And become known as the champion of a
>   new spirit.

Like many participants in the drama of life and the peculiar social and political problems of their times, Iqbal was aware of the social discontent. Fatalism, which was never characteristic of Islam at its best, has often blunted its initiative and atrophied its will to change in some of the reformer's hearts. The clouds of those days have disappeared. "The creation of Pakistan as the condition of an Islamic social ideal; the revolution in Egypt with its philosophy of work and discipline; the Ataturk legacy in Turkey as an example of drastic and successful surgery -- all these and many less spectacular efforts vindicate in contemporary Islam the obedience of a new dimension and response to dynamic impulses."[6] Like John the Baptist's calling for repentance since the "Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," (Matt. 3:2) Iqbal was witnessing that times change

---

[4] James Dickie, "Muhammad Iqbal," A Reappraisal, The Islamic Review, April 1965, 31-34.

[5] Nicholson, "Introduction," The Secret of the Self, p. ix.

> My ringing cry has urged along the road
> The throng that lost their way upon the plain....
>
> The soul of Persia (he went on) moves at my song
> The caravan moves on, my call is strong:
> Out of my restless spirit the flames start.
> In the East's bosom I have stirred a heart.[7]

At this juncture, we pause to ask: What was Iqbal's anxiety to secure Islam against all forms of culture distortion? What did he think of his country's being divided by the barriers of race and country? What were his thoughts on nationalism and imperialism and the politician's machiavellian's ways that worship false gods? What was his dream for his people? Was this dream of an Islamic resurrection only a figment of his mind or something written in the sands of times? Or was there a gospel of action with a clear sense of calling and vision? What is the far-off goal on which his eyes are fixed? What was his message, if there is one, for the Muslim? The answers to these and other questions will reveal his true character and the distinctive contribution of his life in poetry, philosophy, religion and other human endeavors.

---

[6] Cragg, The Call of the Minaret, p. 11.

[7] Iqbal, "Poyami-i-Mashing," Stanzas 141, 142, tr. by A. J. Asberry, The Tulip of Sinai (London: 1947).

Iqbal first went to school in Sialhot in the Punjab, the land of his birth. It was his parents, devout and pious Muslims, who first taught him the teachings of Islam. Later they sent him to the Government College at Lahore where he graduated in 1899 with an M.A. degree in philosophy and was appointed a lecturer in philosophy. It was also in Lahore where his poetical gifts[8] first revealed themselves. In quest of higher learning he studied philosophy at Cambridge, London, where he also qualified as a barrister-at-law. He worked for his doctoral degree at Munich, Germany, and his dissertation was on the development of metaphysics in Persia, which shows a deep grounding in Sufi thought--an illuminating sketch which appeared as a book in 1908. "Iqbal acquired a thorough mastery of the German language and for several years he was steeped in the best that classical German philosophy and literature had to offer."[9] He came back to his teaching at Lahore in 1908. He gave this up two years later and started the private practice of law. He spent some time in study and writing, and it "was not long before he came to be recognized as a thinker of importance and the greatest Urdu poet of his time."[10]

---

[8] His first poems were traditional. Iqbal, like many of his fellow poets, moved away from his earlier complex style to a simple and spontaneous style. This has become an outcome of the increasing clarity and directness of his ideas.

[9] Naravane in his Modern Indian Thought (New York: Asia Publishing House, 1964), points out Iqbal's beautiful poem as a tribute to Goethe, p. 285. For Iqbal and Milton

During his stay in the West, he drank deeply of European literature.[11] He was impressed by the vitality and dynamism of life. His philosophy owes much to Nietzche and Bergson, and his poetry often reminds us of Shelly, Nietzsche's and Bergson's influences are evident in his own thought, and yet the main source of Iqbal's ideas is the Islamic tradition itself. His knowledge of Islamic thought and literature was profound. He had studied very carefully the works of Ibnus Arabi and Al-Jilli. Above all he was indebted to the great mystic thinker and poet of Turkey, Jalal-u'd-din Rumi, whom he quotes again and again with sincere appreciation. Iqbal's poem, Jawid Nama, is an eloquent testimany of Rumi's influence. Rumi, in whom much that is best in the Sufi tradition has found expression, wrote *Masanaui* which contained ideas that appealed to Iqbal's

---

relationship, please see Vahid's *Iqbal-His Art and Thought*; also A. Schimmel's *Gabriel's Wing*, 1963, pp. 316-76.

[10] W. T. DeBary, ed., *Sources of Indian Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), p. 749.

[11] A. Schimmel, "The Western Influence on Sir Muhammad's 'Iqbals' Thought," Proc. IX, *International Congress for the History of Religions* (Tokyo: 1960).

sensitive mind such as the idea of the superiority of love to intellectual knowledge, the idea of cosmic evolution and change, of freedom, and above all the idea of the Perfect Man.[12]

Iqbal had an aversion, however, for those Sufis who tended toward a mystical question. Their philosophy of inaction, he believes, is one cause for the decadence of Islam. Action is life, he taught; and inaction is death. The true meaning of human life lies not in the peace of the grave but in the fight against evil. A religious enthusiast, inspired by the vision of a new mecca, a world wide, theocratic, utopian state in which all Moslems shall be one, Iqbal had a burning belief that Islam provided the remedy for many of the world's ills. This is how he felt and looked at the crisis of his time:

> The division of humanity into national and racial groups was the greatest curse of the day. Injustice in any form was abhorrent and had to be fought. The evils of colonialism,the tyranny of the landlord over the unprotected tenant, the cupidity of capitalism, and the exploitation of the resources of a weaker people by a stronger nation, were all hateful. ... The real remedy lay in the cultivation of the innate greatness of human self, so that realizing its real qualities, it would become incapable of meaner tendencies like greed, injustice and fear.[13]

---

[12] Naravane points out that Iqbal went beyond Rumi in working out the social and cultural implications of the idea of the Self. Modern Indian Thought, pp. 268-89.

[13] Sources of Indian Tradition, p. 750.

Iqbal insisted that the development of the Self is possible only through a true understanding of the relationship between God and man. Even God does not ask for the destruction of the Self; He means the best for every human being and is desirous that the Self should be developed to its fullest capacity. His Persian poem, The Secrets of the Self, presents a theory of the self which is not only a reaction against the doctrine of self-annihilation developed by Muslim mystics but also a statement of his view of man. His philosophy is distinctly voluntaristic and homocentric.[14]

The self, however, finds its fullest essence and purpose, Iqbal believes, only through identification with the life of the community, and to that end the community should be established on a righteous foundation. And it is in his Rumuz-i-Bekhudi or The Mysteries of Selflessness that we find Iqbal's statement on the life of the Islamic Community. This community finds its sole basis on the acceptance of God and the Law, which is the criterion of righteousness. Not limited by time or space, this community can nurture the fullest cultivation of the self. Not meant to be fragmented into nations, this community has the means by which the Self can develop to its fullest height, and this means is Love, which is the Sufic word for the ecstatic devotion to God. We shall discuss this further later on.

---

[14] Naravane, Modern Indian Thought, p. 288.

Iqbal's only prose work is a series of lectures entitled The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam.[15] Though he was known primarily as a poet, he never abandoned his serious philosophical studies. These lectures which he gave at Oxford showed how much Iqbal had been influenced by Western ideas. From Bergson and Nietzsche he derives much of his anti-intellectualism, according primacy to will and conation over reason. In Iqbal's Bal-i-Jabril (The Wings of Gabriel) the Bergsonian philosophy of flux is clearly reflected. But in spite of the close affinity between the thoughts of Iqbal and Bergson (1859-1909), there are nuances, While Bergson's 'Elan Vital' is a blind force, capricious, arbitrary and unforeseeable ---" leading to no purpose, Iqbal's creative will is of the same nature as thought and intelligence; it has an object and is oriented towards an end. The latter's universe is conceived as "a creative life ratinnally directed."[16] The Elan culminates and finds its justification in the Supreme Ego or God. Bergson's elan which ever stands as the Supreme Reality is led to pantheism, while Iqbal's is led to monotheism. Again while giving primacy to love over reason, Iqbal follows in the footsteps of the Muslim Sufis while disagreeing with their self-denying and self-annihilating trends. He claims for intuition a higher place than reason and at the same time he defends revelation on which, he believes, all religion is based. Yet Iqbal does not deny reason in its entirety for it has its own place in the scheme of things. In fact he criticizes Bergson fwr his anti-intellectualism. Iqbal stands for the fusion of the heart and mind.

---

[15] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam (London: Oxford University Press, 1934).

[16] Dickie, "Muhammad Iqbal," A reappraisal, The Islamic Review, April, 1965, 31-34.

Nietzsche's influence is much deeper. In addition to his voluntarism, Nietzsche's philosophy of the Superman fascinated Iqbal. Convinced that the East's suffering is due to its neglect of the Will, Iqbal was attracted by the cult of power and strength. Iqbal pays his tribute to Nietzsche in this statement:

> The final act is not an intellectual act but a vital act which deepens the whole being of the ego and sharpens the will with creative assurance that the world is not something to be merely seen or known through concepts but something to be made and remade.[17]

Both Nietzsche and Iqbal are aiming at the creation of a "Superman." On the other hand, while Nietzsche's superman is an incarnation of a violent and merciless "will," Iqbal's Superman or Perfect Man finds his object and strength in love. Again, both Nietzschean man and Iqbalian man live in a perpetual state of tension and pressures. Yet, the former's purpose is to glorify his physical and mental force by removing all that could hinder him,[18] whereas the latter endeavors to purify and ennoble himself without denying anything or destroying what is in his way. Iqbal summarises this point: "Nietzsche's Superman is a biological product. The Islamic perfect man is the product of moral and spiritual forces."[19]

---

[17] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, p. 18 f.

It is needless to mention here of Iqbal's love for India. "He carried Kashmir's blood in his veins, and his ancestors had cherished the heritage of Sanskrit literature," Naravane notes. "In many of his poems we see a fondness for the Himalayas, an attachment to the broad rivers and the verdant plains of Hindustan, reminiscent of the best in Kalidasa."[20] The unconscious influence of Vedanta on Iqbal's poetic consciousness is demonstrable. Naravane observes that some of Iqbal's comment on the self are reminiscent of the Upanishadic glorification of the Atman.[21]

---

[18] ... Bertrand Russell has with clarity epitomised Nietzsche's philosophy: It does not occur to Nietzsche as possible that a man should genuinely feel universal love, obviously because he himself feels almost universal hatred and fear, which he would fain disguise as lordly indifference. His 'noble' man--who is himself in day dreams--is a being wholly devoid of sympathy, ruthless, cunning, cruel, concerned only with his own power. Quoted in the Islamic Review, April, 1965.

[19] Quoted in Islamic Review, October, 1966, 14.

[20] Naravane, Modern Indian Thought, p. 277.

[21] Ibid., pp. 288, 297. See also review of Iqbal's Pyam-e-Mashrig, Islamic Review, Vol. 38, 1963, 67.

In 1922 Iqbal, on the understanding that it was not a reward for any service he had rendered the government, accepted a knighthood conferred upon him in recognition of his greatness as a poet. Elected to the provincial legislature, he participated in its debate, without making himself a great legislator. He served as a delegate to the Round Table Conference in London in 1931. He did not feel himself suited to politics, and his only real contribution in this field was made as president of an all-India Muslim League session of 1930 when he declared that we would like to see the northwestern areas, where Muslims were in a majority, constituted a separate state. His ideas on the subject were still unclear and elicited no immediate interest, yet "this was the first time that the idea of a separate state for the Muslims had been put forward from the platform of a political party."[22]

Like Buber and Suzuki, Iqbal as a poet availed himself of the privilege of suggestiveness, allusion, and even apparent inconsistency. He was more concerned to challenge believers than to define belief. His philosophy as a whole is centered upon Self. He regards ultimate Reality as an 'active I', which we are now ready to discuss.

---

[22] Sources of Indian Tradition, p. 751.

SECTION I

THE HUMAN EGO

Aware of the fact that the unity of human consciousness which constitutes the center of human personality never really became a point of interest in the history of Muslim thought,[23] Iqbal comes at an opportune time in history with his philosophical insights. One particular aspect of his philosophy, the doctrine of the self or ego, was his most valuable asset around which he built his whole metaphysical system. "Still more significant is the fact that it was with the development of the philosophy of the self that Iqbal just emerged as a thinker of formidable structure."[24] The main strain of his thought was devoted to restoring the spiritual meaning and worth of the human life in a world completely dominated by the dogmas and practices of Science.

> The Scientists adorn a dead body
> They possess not the Hand of Moses,
> The Breath of Jesus[25]

His main concern was to "affirm the existence of God, the reality of the Self, its freedom and Immortality."[26]

---

[23] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, p. 90.

[24] Rofig Ahmed, Iqbal's Notion of the Self, unpublished M.A. Thesis (California, University of Southern California Library, June 1958), Film 300.

[25] Ahmed's translation of Iqbal's Lubur-i-Ajam, p. 11.

[26] Ishrat Hasan Enver, The Metaphysics of Iqbal (Lahore: 1944), p. 3.

In graphic terms, Iqbal describes his anguish and serious concern:

> In the mid-watch of night, when all the world
> Was hushed in slumber, I made loud lament.
> Unto the Living and Omnipotent God
> I made my litany; my longing heart
> Surged, till its blood streamed from my eyes.
> 'How long, O Lord, will the tulip grow.
> Begging cool dewdrops from the dawn?
> Lo, like a candle wrestling with the night
> Over myself I pour my flooding tears.[27]

What then is Iqbal's idea of the Self? What is the nature of this Self? And how does man become conscious of his Self?

Iqbal, though much influenced by Rumi, Arabi and other Sufis,[28] does not believe that Islam ever preached the complete annihilation of self in God. The ego, as a finite centre of experience, is not false. It is real even though its reality is too profound to be intellectualized. It is the fundamental fact of the universe. Self is not, as pantheistic mysticism wants, to be extinguished in the ocean of the Absolute Being, but is to be cultivated by means of Love, working and restless striving. Iqbal cites one characteristic feature of the ego: "The ego reveals itself as a unity of what we call mental states."[29] Not existing in mutual isolation, these mental states mean and involve one another. They exist as phases of a complex whole called mind. A special kind of unity, the organic unity of these inter-related states, is fundamentally different from the unity of a material thing of which parts can exist in mutual isolation. These mental states or events are related to one another forming a continuous flux which is absolutely unique.[30] The unity of the ego, Iqbal explains, has two features, namely (1) the time-span of the ego is pure duration as against that of the physical event; (2) its essential privacy which shows the uniqueness of every ego. Man cannot say, Iqbal writes in an attempt to explain the true time duration which only the ego has, that one of his beliefs is placed on the right or left of my other belief. Nor is it possible to say that his appreciation of the beauty of the Taj varies with his distance from Agra. Man's thought of space is not spatially related to space for the ego can think of more than one space-order, which is not true for the body which has but a single space. While "the duration of the physical event is stretched out in space as a present fact, the ego's duration is concentrated within it and linked with its present and future in a unique manner."[31]

---

[27] Iqbal, _Rumuz-i-Bekhudi_, _The Mysteries of Selflessness_.

[28] N. M. Sultan Maricar, "Iqbal-Re Muslim International Poet," _The Islamic Review_, April 1962. See also _The Asian Review_, Vol. 3, No. 1, April, 1966.

[29] Iqbal, _The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam_, p. 93.

The dentist may have all the sympathy in this world,

---

[30] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, p. 94.

[31] Idem.

Iqbal attempts to explain the uniqueness of every ego, but he cannot experience the feeling of my toothache. "My pleasures, pains, and desires are exclusively mine, forming a part and parcel of my private ego alone. My feelings, hates and loves, judgments and resolutions, are exclusively mine."[32] Only man himself can feel and choose for himself, even God cannot do the judging and deciding for him.

Believing in grades or degrees of reality, Iqbal says that the nature of the ego is such that notwithstanding its potentiality to respond to other egos, "It is self-centered and possesses a private circuit of individuality excluding all other egos other than itself."[33] The true nature of reality is ego-hood. And ego-hood has reached its relative perfection in man who has a genuine place in the heart of Divine creative energy, and therefore possesses a much higher degree of reality than things and objects around him. "Of all the creations of God he alone is capable of consciously participating in the creative life of his Master."[34]

The self, Iqbal tells us, has two aspects, the external and the internal or the efficient and the appreciative. In its first element, the external or efficient the self enters into relations with things of space. This is what the psychologist generally studies and its interpretation is found in terms of the laws of association. But we get a glimpse of understanding reality in the internal aspect. "It is only in the moments of profound meditation, when the efficient self is in abeyance, that we sink into our deeper self and reach the inner centre of experience. In the life process of this deeper ego, the states of consciousness melt into each other. The unity of the appreciative ego is like the unity of the germ in which the experiences of its individual ancestors exist, not as a plurality, but as a unity in which every experience permeates the whole," Iqbal explains. "There is a numerical distinctness of states in the totality of the ego, the multiplicity of whose elements is, unlike that of the efficient self, wholly qualitative. There is change and movement, but this change and movement are indivisible; their elemants interpenetrate and are wholly non-serial in character. It appears that the time of the appreciative self is a single 'now' which the efficient self, in its traffic with the world of space, pulverizes into a series of 'nows' like the pearl beads on a thread. Here is, then, pure duration unadulterated by space."[35]

---

[32] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, pp. 94-95.

[33] Ibid., p. 68.

[34] Ibid., p. 69.

The life and activity of the Ego is always in moments of tension, that is, the Ego invades the environment and the latter invades the former. Never standing outside this arena of mutual invasion, the Ego is present in it as a directive energy and is formed and disciplined by its own experience. Iqbal quotes the Quran to explain the directive function of the ego:

---

[35] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, pp. 45-46.

> And they ask thee of the soul,
> Say: the soul proceedeth from my
> Lord's 'Amr' (Command); but of
> knowledge, only a little to you is given. (17:8f)

"Amr,"[36] Iqbal points out, is one of the two words to express the two ways in which the creative activity of God reveals itself to us. The other word is "Khalq" which means Creation; "Amr" means direction. The meaning of the verse in the Quran which says "To Him belong creation and direction," is that the "essential nature of the soul is directive, as it proceeds from the directive energy of God, though we do not know how Divine Amr functions as ego-unities."[37] The ego is directive, constantly engaged in creation of desires, ideals and will-attitudes. Man's personality is not a thing in space or a set of experiences in temporal order; rather it's an act resulting from a directive attitude. Ego's life is always in open possibility.

---

[36] Iqbal points out that the English language has only one word for creation, while the Arabic language has two: "Amr and Khalq". See The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, p. 97.

[37] *Ibid.*, pp. 97-98; see also Jaridname, L 1135.

How then is this ego, this man who is called not to abandon this world, to live in this spatio-temporal order? Iqbal resorts again to the Quran to answer this question:

> Now of fine clay have We created man: There We place him, a moist germ, in a sage abode; then made We the moist germ a clot of blood: then made the clotted blood into a piece of flesh: then made the piece of flesh into bones: and We clothed the bones with flesh: then brought forth man of yet anothwr make. Blessed therefore, the God--the most excellent of makers.[38]

Man's mind and body become one in action. My taking a book from the table is an act which is single and indivisible. To draw a line of cleavage between the share of the body and that of the mind in this act is impossible, Iqbal ellucidates. My body is not a thing situated in an absolute void; it is a system of events or acts. The system of experiences we call soul or ego is also a system of acts. "This does not obliterate the distinction of soul and body," Iqbal maintains, "it only brings them closer to each other. The characteristic of the ego is spontaniety; the acts composing the body repeat themselves. The body is accumulated action or habit of the soul, and as suhh undetachable from it. It is a permanent element, appears from the outside as something stable."[39]

---

[38] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, p. 98.

[39] Ibid., p. 100.

The true ego lives in and makes use of the world of matter.[40] The world of matter, which Iqbal regards as non-ego, is the greatest obstacle in the way to the freedom of the ego, but it is not to be considered as evil; it is necessary enabling the inner powers of life to unfold themselves. Nicholson in his attempt to interpret Iqbal's notion of self writes: "The true person not only absorbs the world of matter; by mastering it he absorbs God Himself into his Ego. Life is a forward assimilative movement. ... Its essence is the continual creation of desires and ideals, and for the purpose of it its preservation and expansion it has invented or developed out of itself certain instruments, e.g. senses, intellect, etc., which help in to assimilate obstructions."[41]

Yes, neither the world nor thought should be left behind. Criticizing other writers who have not noticed a deeper aspect of thought, Iqbal points out that:

> In its deeper moment, however, thought is capable of reaching an immanent Infinite in whose self-unfolding movement the variously finite concepts are merely moments. In its essential nature, then, thought is not static; it is dynamic and unfolds its internal infinitude in time like the seed which, from the very beginning, carries within the organic unity of the tree as a fact. Thought is therefore the whole in its dynamic self-expression, appearing

---

[40] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, pp. 100-01.

[41] Iqbal, The Secrets of Self, p. xx.

> to the temporal vision as a series of definite specifications which cannot be understood except by reciprocal reference. This meaning lies not in their self-identity, but in the larger whole of which they are the specific aspects. The larger whole is, to use a Quranic metaphor, a kind of "Preserved Tablet" which holds up the entire undermined possibilities of knowing as a present reality, revealing itself in serial time as a succession of finite concepts appearing to reach a unity which is already present to them.[42]

"The element of guidance and directive control in the ego's activity clearly shows that the ego is a free personal causality."[43] "The ego attains to freedom by the removal of all obstructions in its way. It is partly free, partly determined, and reaches fuller freedom by approaching the Individual who is most free--God."[44] Man shares in the life and freedom of the Ultimate Ego who allowed the emergence of a finite ego capable of private initiative, and thereby limited this freedom of His own free will. The Quran supports this view on the freedom of conscious behavior:

> And say: The truth is from you Lord:
> Let him, then, who will, believe; and
> let him who will, be an unbeliever. (18:28)
>
> If ye do well to your own belief will ye
> do well: and if ye do evil against
> yourselves will ye do it. (17:7)

---

[42] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, p. 8.

[43] Ibid., p. 103.

[44] Iqbal, The Secrets of The Self, p. xxi.

Iqbal, recognizing the emphasis of Islam on this rise and fall of the power to act freely, calls for the retention of this power to act freely as a constant and undiminished factor in the life of the ego, The timing of the daily prayer and meditation restores 'self-possession' to the ego, according to the Quran, by bringing it into closer touch with the ultimate source of life and freedom. One purpose of the timing of the daily prayer is to "save the ego from the mechanizing effects of sleep and business." Prayer which restores "self-possession to the ego by bringing it into closer touch with the ultimate source of life and freedom is the "ego's escape from mechanism to freedom."[45] And in short, life is a struggle for freedom.

SECTION II

LOVE (ISHQ) FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE EGO

The human self is active, dynamic, creative and free. And it is in these qualities that Iqbal regards and glorifies man. "The Quran teaches creative freedom of the human ego...," Iqbal writes. "The parable of Adam's fall from a state of primitive instinctive appetite to the conscious possession of a free self capable of doubts and disobedience signifies the emergence of a finite ego, free to choose, ... that God has taken this risk shows his immense faith in man. It is for men now to justify this faith."[46] This "risk" which God takes is not the result merely of a capricious or an adventurous mood. The very fulfillment of God's essential nature necessitates the "construction" of the human self.[47]

---

[45] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, p. 103.

The ego, whose most valuable achievement is personality which is a state of tension and continues only if that state is maintained, is fortified by love or Ishq. The highest form of love[48] is the creation of values and ideals and the struggle to realize them. This point is best explained in Iqbal's words:

> The luminous point whose name is Self
> Is the life-spark beneath our dust.
> By love it is made more lasting,
> More living, more burning, more glowing.
> From love proceeds the radiance of its being
> And the development of its unknown
>   possibilities.
> Its nature gathers fire from love,
> Love instructs it to illumine the world.
> Love fears neither sword nor dagger,
> Love is not born of water and air and
>   earth.
> Love makes peace and war in the world,
> Love is the fountain of life, love is
>   the flashing sword of death.
> The hardest rocks are shivered by love's
>   glance:
> Love of God at last becomes wholly God.[49]

---

[46] Iqbal, Lectures on Metaphysics (Cambridge, 1908), p. 80.

[47] Cf. Tagore: "It is in my world that your highest privilege will be realised." Quoted and translated by Naravane, Modern Indian Thought, p. 291.

[48] This word 'love' is used in a very wide sense and it means the desire to assimilate, to absorb.

[49] Iqbal, The Secrets of The Self, pp. 28-29.

Love individualizes both the lover and the beloved. "The effort to realize the most unique individuality individualizes the seeker and implies the individuality of the sought, for nothing else would satisfy the nature of the seeker."[50] Since love strengthens the Ego, asking (su'al) weakens it.[51] Anything that is attained without personal effort and work falls under su'al. Anyone who inherits his parents' wealth is an asker or beggar, so is everyone who thinks the thoughts of others. Cultivate love, the power of assimilative action and avoid all forms of "asking" or inaction, Iqbal suggests. Defining desires as primarily the striving after ideals as the sources of man's activity and progress, Iqbal says that:

> Life is preserved by progress:
> Because of the goal its caravan-bell tinkles.
> Life is latent in seeking,
> Its origin is hidden in desire.
> Keep desire alive in thy heart,
> Lest thy little dust become a tomb.
> . . . . . .
> 'Tis desire that enriches life,
> And the mind is a child of its womb.
> And what are social organization, customs,
>   and laws?
> What is the secret of the novelties of science?
> A desire which realized itself by its own strength
> And burst forth from the heart and took shape.[52]

---

[50] Iqbal, The Secrets of The Self, p. xxvi.

[51] Ibid., p. 38, Line 435 ff.

[52] Ibid., pp. 23, 25-27.

Iqbal believes that love is man's greatest desire. And love is meant to be for the ecstatic love of God, not in any quietist, passive sense, but as the source of the highest inspiration for true knowledge and effective action.

> Rise intoxicated with the wine of an ideal,
> An ideal shining as the dawn
> A blazing fire to all that is other than God,
> An ideal higher than Heaven---
> Winning, captivating, enchanting men's hearts;
> A destroyer of ancient falsehood,
> Fraught with turmoil, an embodiment of the Last Day.
> We live by forming ideals,
> We glow with the sunbeams of desires![53]

In an effort to hint at the general principles of Moslem ethics and to reveal their meaning in relation to the idea of personality, Nicholson mentions three stages through which the Ego has to pass in its movements toward uniqueness. These are (1) Obedience to the Law; (2) Self-control, which is the highest form of self-consciousness or ego-hood; (3) Divine Vicegerency.[54] Speaking of the first stage, Iqbal declares:

> Service and toil are traits of the camel,
> Patience and perseverances are ways of the
> camel.
> Noiselessly he steps along the sandy track,
> He is the ship of those who voyage in
> the desert.
> Every thicket knows the print of his foot;
> He eats seldom, sleeps little, and is
> inured to toil.[55]

---

[53] Iqbal, The Secrets of The Self, pp. 23, 25-27.

[54] Ibid., p. 72.

[55] Ibid., p. 74, L 840-45.

Obedience makes the man of no worth worthy, while disobedience turns man's fire to ashes. Iqbal's man of faith never complains of the hardness of the Law for the Law, the source of strength, "makes everything strong within."

How then can this master of himself who has learned to transcend himself act? Only he has to act.

> The pit of life is contained in action
> To delight in creation is the law of life.[56]

How can one cease to be selfish? How is one to be ruler of oneself? Iqbal writes:

> Thy soul cares only for itself, like the camel:
> It is self-conceited, self-governed, and self-
> willed.
> Be a man, get its halter into thine hand,
> That thou mayest become a pearl albeit
> thou art a potter's vessel.[57]

And further he declares:

> If thou canst rule Thy camel, thou wilt
> rule the world
> And wear on thy head the crown of Solomon.[58]

But in order to become the Superman or man of faith, one must be of strong inner stuff:

---

[56] Iqbal, The Secrets of The Self, p. 89.

[57] Ibid., p. 75.

[58] Ibid., pp. 78-79.

> The man of strong character who is
> master of himself
> Will find fortune complaint.
> If the world does not comply with his
> humour,
> He will try the hazard of war with Heaven.[59]

This man of strong character with qualities of patience and self-control is, first of all, the chosen representative of God on earth. The Quran supports this view of man as the "trustee of a free personality which he accepted at his peril:"[60]

> Afterwards his Lord chose him (Adam) for
> himself and was
> turned towards him, and guided him. (20:114)
>
> When thy Lord said to the angels, "Verily
> I am about to place one in my stead
> on Earth," they said, "Wilt
> Thou place there one who will do ill therein
> and shed blood, when we celebrate Thy praise
> and extol Thy holiness?" God said, "Verily
> I know what you know not." (2:28)

Passing through the third and last stage of human growth and development on earth (divine vicegerency, niyabat-i-ilahi); the vicegerbent (na'ib) is the vicegerent of God on earth. And how sweet it is

> ... to be God's vicegerent in the world
> and exercise sway over the elements.
> God's vicegerent is as the soul of the universse,

---

[59] Iqbal, The Secrets of The Self, p. 90.

[60] Quran, 33:72.

His being is the shadow of the Greatest Name.
He knows the mysteries of part and whole
He executes the command of Allah in the world.[61]

Able to control the entire nature, of course, in the name of God, he is the "completest Ego, the goal of humanity, the acme of life both in mind and body; in him the discord of our mental life becomes a harmony."[62] He is nearest to God, "the highest power is united in him with the highest knowledge." He is the "last fruit of the tree of humanity in whose life, thought and action, instinct and reason, become one," and all the travails and trials of a difficult evolution are justified because he is to come finally.[63]

Then how can one attain this power? How can one cease to be selfish? How can one who is the ruler of the world in the name of God be a ruler of oneself? Is it by absolute and complete self-submission to God? Does love of God require such self-surrender? Certainly not self-negation, Iqbal categorically declares. He is opposed to every idea of self-negation. Rather what he teaches is not self-negation but self-affirmation and self-assertion. "Physically as well as spiritually man is a self-contained centre, but he is not yet a complete individual. The greater his distance from God the less his individuality. He who comes nearest to God is the completest person. Not that he is finally absorbed in God. On the contrary, he absorbs God into himself."[64] Apparently the self-affirmation which Iqbal is preaching is to such extreme as to espouse or proclaim the absorption of even the Ultimate Ego, God, and not submit to him. Life with its assimilative process is an absorbing activity which assimilates even God. And the good and evil are to be interpreted in terms of this activity. Personality, which gives us a standard of value, thus settling the problem of good and evil, is the tension we experience in this process and activity. And that which strengthens personality is good, and that which weakens it is evil.[65]

---

[61] Iqbal, The Secrets of the Self, p. 79.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. xxvii.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. xxvii.

Thus while others proclaim the union of oneself with God by complete surrender to him and being absorbed by him, Iqbal preaches that man should become one with God rather by absorbing him, when our self-affirmation and self-assertion become complete. This certainly is a risky advice, and it may rightly be followed by a few people. But it easily misleads others to interpret that selfishness and self-aggrandizement form the avenue to reality. To understand the truth underlying Iqbal's words, P. T. Raju suggests, one must recall Hindu intellectualism and Islamic pantheism which, Iqbal felt, tended to deprive man of his capacity for power and action, and incalcate in him "a spirit of resignation miscalled contentment, born of weakness and self-abnegation."[66] To relieve man of this spirit of "dis-ease", Iqbal proclaims self-assertion, and emphasizes it so strongly, that it appears as amounting to the subjugation of God himself for one's objective and goal. However, Iqbal could not have thought of that; for it would be difficult to understand lines like the beginning of the Zarb-i-Kalim:

---

[64] Iqbal, The Secrets of The Self, p. xix.

[65] Ibid., pp. 28, 38.

> The hidden secret of Self is 'there is
> no God but God'
> The cutting sword of Self is 'there is
> no God but God.'[67]

Again he declares:

> Gain knowledge of Life's mysteries.
> Be a tyrant. Ignore all except God.[68]

Man's duty to God and accordingly the primacy of God in all of life is reiterated. However, in short, one can only declare that there is an over-emphasis on self-assertion, though it may be to counteract the mischief wrought by the spirit of self-assertion and passivity."[69]

---

[66] Raju, Idealistic Thought of India, p. 391.

[67] Quoted by A. Schimmel, Gabriel's Wings, p. 111.

[68] Iqbal, The Secrets of The Self, p. 73.

Along with this doctrine of self-assertion, Iqbal proclaims a doctrine of vigorous and active love. The will to power should be the will to love and to the unfolding of the good potencies of the Self. "The Nietzschean Ubermensch" is, A. Schimmel writes, "only for a certain moment an ideal for Iqbal; but Superman's denial of God is not tolerable for the Muslim thinker. The superman he wants to see is the Perfect Man of Islamic mysticism, personified once in the Prophet Muhammad and the highest rank this Perfect Man can reach is that of abduhu "slave of God."[70] Notwithstanding Raju's indecision[71] about Iqbal's assertion on the non-annihilation of the human ego in God, A. Schimmel explains that Iqbal's man of faith or "slave of God" is one who is always acting in complete harmony with his Creator and never forgets the Divine command.

This active love, A. Schimmel points out, is the force which brings man nigh to God and consolidates the ego, and which sometimes even corresponds to intuition. It is the fiery element which enables the growth of the personality, and without which real life cannot exist.[72] In Iqbal's imagination, reason and science which we shall discuss in Chapter V (as a part of the dialogue of the three writers, Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal), are often compared to an idol-temple, and love is the power which destroys all the false deities which intellect puts in the way of life:

---

[69] Raju, Idealistic Thought of India, p. 392.

[70] Proceedings, IXth International Congress for History of Religion, Tokyo, 1958, A. Schimmel, The Western Influence on Iqbal's Thought, p. 706.

[71] Raju, Idealistic Thought of India, p. 392.

[72] Schimmel, Gabriel's Wings, p. 128.

> The whole world bows in adoration to love
> Love is the Mahumud that conquers the
> Somnath of Intellect.[73]

This love requires a surrender of the whole personality, including will, thought and action to God. "The Fountain of Life is Love's flashing sword," Iqbal writes to put more emphasis on the kind of love that is required of the Perfect man.[74]

Now if one has to affirm himself, is he to abandon his desires and impulses, reasoning that they belong to the flesh and not the soul? As mentioned earlier in Section I, Iqbal has an appreciative understanding of the material nature for he believes in its reality as well as its importance in the growth and development of the Self:

> Life is latent in seeking,
> Its origin is hidden in desire,
> Keep desire alive in thy heart,
> Lest thy little dust become a tomb.

---

[73] Iqbal, *The Secrets of The Self*, p. 29.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

And what is desire, but "the noose for hunting ideals, a binder of the book of deeds," Iqbal writes. "Negation of desire is death to the living."[75]

> Life is the hunter and desire the snare,
> Desire is Love's message to beauty.[76]

Duty to God which Iqbal preaches is the criterion, for Iqbal cannot be charged with expousing the indulgence of any and every desire. The desires and impulses must naturally conform to this duty. Raju clarifies this quite clearly when he reasons that "only to counteract the teaching of other-worldliness and the escape from things material, must he, Iqbal, have been glorifying desire so much. Self-affirmation is possible only through out acting for the satisfaction of desires." And it is only for the satisfaction of desires," he continues, "that matter is appropriated and made part of self."[77]

"Self-affirmation brings not-self to light."[78]

This man of faith, who is called to affirm himself by being the ruler of himself and of the world with the will to love, is also challenged to be related with other men. Iqbal in an attempt to correct the over-individualistic tone and effect of his previous work, *The Secrets of the Self*, wrote *Mysteries of Selflessness* which emphasizes the Muslim community. The Muslims are united throughout space and time by a common faith and a common history. To Iqbal's view of community we shall now turn for discussion.

---

[75] Iqbal, The Secrets of The Self, p. 25.

[76] Ibid., p. 61.

[77] Raju, Idealistic Thought of India, p. 393.

[78] Iqbal, The Secrets of The Self, pp. 16, 18-19.

SECTION III

COMMUNITY AND THE ULTIMATE EGO

God is concerned as an Ego, the Ultimate Ego, according to Iqbal, whose Egohood is realized in full in man's relationship with Him in prayer and meditation. As Tillich has pointed out:

> Man becomes man in personal encounters. Only by meeting a thou does man realize that he is an ego.[79]

In a similar light, Buber writes: "I become through my relation to the Thou; as I become I, I say Thou."[80]

Iqbal joins Tillich and Buber in this self-realization of the human ego which may be understood as "higher than everything you see."[81] Similarly, Iqbal's idea of

---

[79] P. Tillich, *Love, Power and Justice*, p. 78.

[80] Buber, *I and Thou*, p. 11.

[81] Iqbal, *Zabur-i Ajam* (Gulshan-i naz-' Jadid, L 327).

Self may be compared to that of Eucken's cancept of self which is "in one meaning the proposition, in the other one the perfection of striving, there as self-being, here as self-becoming, there as a fact, here as a task."[82] This is to say that Self is both existent and still to be perfected, it is a given, real thing and yet a task before man:

> 'Tis the nature of the Self to manifest itself:
> In every atom slumbers the might of the Self.[83]

Out of the richness of his nature, this man whose faith is in the independence of one's own inner life lavishes the wealth of life on others and brings them nearer and nearer to God. Knowing that his kingdom is the kingdom of God on earth, and "aware of the present crisis in the history of India, Iqbal demands complete organization and unity of will and purpose in the Muslim community, both in your own interest as a community and in the interest of India as a whole."[84] The spirit and message of this community is best stated in Iqbal's words:

---

[82] Eucken, Der Sinn und Wert des Lebens, p. 39. Quoted in A. Schimmel's Gabriel's Wing, p. 102.

[83] Iqbal, The Secrets of The Self, p. 19, L 229.

[84] One must recall at this point that Iqbal, reflecting the concern of Muslims at that time over the fate of the Ottoman empire and other Muslim lands conquered or threatened by European powers, propagated pan-Islamism based on the doctrine of an indivisible Muslim community. See Iqbal, Speeches and Statements.... especially his presidential address before All-India Muslim League, Allahabad, December 29, 1930, pp. 3-12, 34-36.

A common aim shared by the multitude
Is unity which, when it is mature,
Forms the Community; the many live
Only by virtue of the single bond.
The Muslim's unity from natural faith
Derives, and this the Prophet taught us,
So that we lit a lantern on truth's way.
This pearl was fished from his unfathomed sea,
And of his bounty we are one in soul.
Let not this unit go from our hands,
And we endure to all eternity.[85]

Back in 1910, Iqbal noted that there are principally three stages in the development of a community; namely, (1) the attitude of skepticism towards traditional religion--a revolt against dogma, (2) but the need of religion as a social factor of great value is at last felt, and then begins the second stage--an attempt to reconcile religion with reason, (3) different opinions on the very existence of a community exist but there are forces of a different nature at work which have a tendency to preserve the solidarity of the community.[86] Believing that Muslims profess no Fatherland, Iqbal interprets thus:

Our Essence is not bound to any place;
The vigor of our wine is not contained
In any bowl; Chinese and Indian
Alike the share that constitutes our jar,
Turkish and Syrian alike the clay
Forming our body; neither is our heart
Of India, or Syria, or Rum,
Nor any fatherland do we profess
Except Islam.[87]

---

[85] Iqbal, The Mysteries of Selflessness, trans. by Arthur Arberry (London: J. Murray, 1953), p. 20.

[86] Stray Reflections (1910) ed. Jarrid Iqbal (1961), p. 58.

[87] Iqbal, The Mysteries of Selflessness, p. 29.

In spite of the charge that Iqbal is culturally and nationally one-sided,[88] Iqbal holds that the concept of country divides humanity.

> Now brotherhood has been so cut to shreds
> That in the stead of community
> The country has been given pride of place
> In men's allegiance and constructive work;
> The country is the darling of their hearts,
> And wide humanity is whittled down
> Into dismembered tribes. . . .
> Vanished is humankind; there but abide
> The disunited nations. Politics
> Dethroned religion. . . .[89]

Like his concept of Self, which is not defined by space and time, Iqbal teaches that the Muslim Community is unbounded in time:

> . . . When the burning brands
> Of time's great revolution ring our mead,
> Then Spring returns. The mighty power of Rome,
> Conqueror and ruler of the world entire,
> Sank into small account; the golden glass
> Of the Sassanians was drowned in blood;
> Broken the brilliant genius of Greece;
> Egypt too failed in the great test of time,
> Her bones lie buried neath the pyramids.
>
> Yet still the voice of the Muezzin rings
> Throughout the earth, still the Community
> Of World-Islam maintains its ancient forms.
> Love is the universal law of life,
> Mingling the fragmentary elements
> Of a disordered world. Through our heart's glow
> Love lives, irradiated by the spark
> There is no god but God.[90]

---

[88] A. Schimmel, Gabriel's Wing, p. 86; see also Morgan, Islam The Straight Path, p. 322.

[89] Iqbal, The Mysteries of Selflessness, p. 32.

[90] Ibid., pp. 36-37.

Love dwells within the spirit, Iqbal writes, which is stronger far than race, color and nationalities. Yes, the community of love is

> Like the light of God; whatever being we
> Possess, from its existence is derived.[91]

In this community of love, the immutable qualities in the Self are created. Since Islam recognizes no superiority of birth or rank or wealth within its bosom and judges excellence by righteousness alone, the fullest cultivation of the self is possible within its fold. Bound together by faith alone, the community of love unfolds the qualities and develops the potentialities of each Self.

---

[91] Iqbal, The Mysteries of Selflessness, pp. 75-76.

CHAPTER V

BUBER, SUZUKI AND IQBAL

Certainly Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal in their own unique ways, methods, and attitudes have given us some glimpses of their insights and thoughts on selfhood. They have joined psychologists, anthropologists, philosophers, theologians and others in awakening us to re-evaluate the original meaning of personhood or personality and to reconsider this whole question.

The original usage of the Latin word persona[1] is two-fold: (1) the mask worn by actors, and (2) a designation of a responsible legal entity. Both these usages are found in early theological writings. Tertullian as a lawyer-theologian reflected the legal usage, while scholars and theologians in their discussion of the Trinity followed the dramatic usage. Among the modern theologians who have joined Buber, Suzuki, and Iqbal in enlightening us on the definition of personality is Tillich, who says that personality is "that being which has the power over itself."[2]

Like Tillich, Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal have used the dramatic usage rather than the legal concept[3] where an agency or a corporation can be a legal person. It is apparent that all three philosophers generally agree with Tillich's moral concept:

---

[1] Manresa, Commentaries on the Civil Code of the Philippines (Manila, 1934).

[2] "The Idea and the Ideal of Personality" in Tillich's book, The Protestant Era (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), pp. 115 f.

> pointing to a being which we are asked to respect as the bearer of a dignity equal to our own and which we are not permitted to use as a means for a purpose, because it is purpose itself. This is the basis of personality, the individual human being, the person who alone among all beings has the potentiality of self-determination and, consequently, or personality.[4]

All three thinkers understand man as essentially a "socius". They point to the main significance of relations between persons and of the social nature of reality. The predominant tone in their thoughts and writings is the conviction that life is essentially a complex of relationships, and personality, as described by Tillich, always occurs in community: "a human self assumes personal character in the presence of, and in relation to, other human selves."[5] It is in encounter, in persons-in-community, in communication with others, variously conceived, that the free, independent, responsible human being is attained.

---

[3] New Civil Code of the Philippines (Manila: Philippines Bureau of Printing).

[4] Tillich, The Protestant Era, p. 115.

[5] John Hutchison, Faith, Reason and Existence (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 76.

On the other hand, their common view of the social self is held in quite different approaches to the problem, in different ways and different terminologies, and different world views. Of course, there are remarkable points of contact. Yet considering their respective spiritual trajectories, the variety of thought patterns employed, the inner implications they signify, one can note that their differences are as important as their similarities. And it is in this chapter that we try to let each man present his views in a dialogic discussion.

Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal seem to stand within the intuitive, existential and religious tradition. All three may be thinking of different views of personhood and a different kind of reality. Thus a complete comparison is tremendously hard. They have complex and germinal minds, and they may appear, for some reasons, unclear and unprecise in some of their concepts and words.[6] Thus any simple systematization of their doctrines and beliefs is foredoomed. Yet further examination of their views leads me to conclude that all three speak the language of faith and revelation.

---

[6] All three wrote in their own native languages; Buber in Hebrew and German; Suzuki in Japanese, though he tried quite successfully in English, etc.; Iqbal in Urdu, Persian and other languages. Most of Buber's and Iqbal's writings are translated to English; and it is well known that many times something happens in the translation.

There is no evidence to support the contention that any or all of the three men have read each other's writings. Yet they may have heard of each other since they lived in the same century. They are men of their times, wrestling with the issues of their day and struggling to find and provide some possible solutions to man's problems. It is possible that they have read the same books and writings, and have admired, and have been influenced by the same philosophers or poets. For example, Buber has read Western philosophers, and has been greatly influenced by Goethe and Socrates. He has pointed to Socrates[7] as one who exemplified man's dialogic relation with persons, and "how lovely and how legitimate the sound of the full I of Goethe! It is the I of pure intercourse with nature...."[8] Iqbal writes:

> I confess I owe a great deal to Hegel, Goethe, Mirza Ghali, Mirza Abdul Qadir Bedil and Wordsworth. The first two led me into the 'inside' of things, the third and fourth taught me how to remain oriental in spirit and expression after having assimilated foreign ideals, the last saved me from atheism in my student days.[9]

Suzuki, having worked in the United States for a number of years and later having lectured in different universities in Europe and America, surely has a good knowledge of the Western philosophers and poets. For example, in his lectures on Zen Buddhism he referred to Tennyson.[10]

---

[7] Buber, *I and Thou*, p. 66.

[8] *Idem*.

[9] Quoted in Schimmel's *Gabriel's Wing*, p. 137.

Speaking of the Eastern and Western influences on the three men, Nicholson opines that in Iqbal "the East and West met though it would be too much to say that they were united."[11]

Schimmel has this to say: "Iqbal has used all the life-giving force he found in East and West for the changing of the destiny of his people, just as he sings in the Peyam-i-Nahrig:

> Open thine eyes, if thou hast eyes
> to see!
> Life is the building of the world
> to be.[12]

Buber's "Autobiographical Fragments"[13] speaks of events that had decisive influence on his personal life and through this on his thought. By no means uninfluenced by by the intellectual currents of his time, he took in a bewilderingly rich variety of them. Twenty years after Buber's I and Thou appeared, J. H. Oldham has this to say: "I question whether any book has been published in the present century the message of which if it were understood, would have such far-reaching consequences for the life of our time."[14] It can probably be proven that an Eastern mind can understand much better Martin Buber's writings than one who operates in a rigorously logical philosophical system and is only interested in piling up scientifically descriptive data.

---

[10] Suzuki, et al., Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 3. See also Van meter Ames, Zen and American Thought (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1962).

[11] Nicholson, who translated Iqbal's The Secrets of The Self, has pointed out both the western and eastern traces in the latter's life. Quoted in History of Religion (Tokyo: 1960), p. 705.

[12] History of Religion (Tokyo: 1960), p. 708.

[13] The Philosophy of Martin Buber, pp. 3-31.

Suzuki's thorough knowledge of both Eastern and Western concepts and his use of terminologies are to be commended. He has pointed out the two basic characteristic approaches to reality when he selected two poets, Basho and Tennyson.[15] He seems very sure of the two distinctive approaches, Eastern and Western, analyzing each of them with his excellent command of the English language. On the other hand, in his great attempt to advocate the Zen approach to reality[16] as the best way of understanding existence and reality, Suzuki misses the whole point of not being aware of and allowing both the rational and non-rational aspects of man to function in every living human being. He appears to have a neatly classified distinction and his systematization of the distinct approaches makes one suspicious. It is true that the Western mind is generally and substantially analytical, objective, scientific, conceptual, impersonal, etc.,[17] but it cannot be denied also that the non-rational elements/do not play their role in every man's daily life and decision. Again it may be said that the Eastern traits as against those of the Western mind can be characterized as "synthetic, totalizing, integrating ... intergrative...."[18] However, it is not that simple to categorize logically and say that the rational faculties of the Eastern man in actual practice are not used in man's thoughts and actions whether one has the Eastern or Western mind. Again he writes "to study Zen means to have Zen-experience ... the experience ceases to be vital unless it is adequately expressible."[19] Can one truly communicate what happens to himself? Zen may be applicable to all human situations, modern as well as ancient, Western as well as Eastern. But to say that "Zen is in fact the spirit of all religions and philosophies"[20] is presumptuous; this assertion may be taken as an aggressive propaganda of Zen Buddhism, or an "alleged secularization of Zen by Dr. Suzuki."[21]

---

[14] See Friedman, Martin Buber: The Life of Dialogue, Tillich, "Jewish Influence on Contemporary Christian Theology," Cross Currents, Vol. 11, No. 3, Spring 1952, "Martin Buber and Christian Thought," Commentary, Vol. , No. 6, June 1948.

[15] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, pp. 5-10.

[16] Ibid.

---

[17] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 5.

[18] Idem.

[19] Suzuki, Studies in Zen, p. 62.

[20] Book review by Hiroshi Sakamoto, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, Vol. 1, No. 1, September 1965, p. 129.

Buber writes out of an attitude of faith, a faith that has never been argued and denied by the soul of Israel:[22] faith as trust, as contracting a covenant with the everlasting, eternal thou. God's omnipresence in His creation cannot be disputed, and He speaks in and through His people. It is never Buber's purpose to present a neat system of ready-made categories or to limit the boundaries of man's thought and action. His aim lies "not in the world as presented to and worked over by thought, but in the world as given to man as his material for creation."[23] "Philosophical Accounting"[24] shows that he does not regard himself as belonging to the traditional categories of philosopher and theologian who in some respects put God as a being who occupies a definite position in a definite system of thought. His interest in God is quite similar to Pascal, who declares that the philosopher's idea of the Absolute dissolves at the point where God lives. Buber is not so much concerned with philosophical debates which may lead one to have his conclusions in a book of tight logic. Rather he is thinking more of the religious experience where "God is the reality whom man meets, and to whom man can respond."[25] Perhaps Schneider has said it rightly when he wrote "... God always meets man on the level of man's personal essence."[26] And "God dwells wherever man lets him in."[27] The element of holy insecurity, and a dimension of myth and mystery are indeed present in religion.

---

[21] For a sympathetic treatment and plausible defense of this assertion, please see above article, review of Zen In Westlicher Sicht, Zen-Buddhismus-Zen Snobismus, by Ernest Benz, The Eastern Buddhist, pp. 126-32.

[22] Buber, Mamre, pp. 1-17; Israel and the World, pp. 13-52.

[23] Ibid., pp. 20, 30.

[24] The Philosophy of Martin Buber, pp. 689-92.

Thus, it is almost impossible to classify Buber's writings and compare his philosophy with other systems. "No system was suitable for what I had to say. Structure was suitable for it, a compact structure but not one that joined everything together,"[28] Buber explains his "Philosophical Accounting" where he opposed many simplifications that his questioners and critics have undertaken. Buber "witnessed for experience and appealed to experience,"[29] and we can only appeal to the experience of other men as authenticating what Buber says.

Both Suzuki and Iqbal may endorse what Buber has said. Suzuki, who emphasizes experience as the foundation of religious life, confesses:

---

[25] Buber, I and Thou, pp. 75 ff.

[26] Philosophy of Martin Buber, p. 473.

[27] Buber, The Way of Man, p. 41.

[28] Philosophy of Martin Buber, "Replies to Critics," p. 693.

[29] Idem.

> If it were possible for me to talk with them now, I would tell them that my ideas have changed from theirs somewhat, I now think that a religion based solely on science is not enough. There are certain "mythological" elements in every one of us, which cannot be altogether lost in favor of science. This is a conviction I have come to. By this I do not mean that religion is not to undergo a rigorous purging of all its "impure" elements.[30]

Iqbal has highlighted the importance of scientific methods as taught, according to him, first by the Quran:

> Science is an instrument for the preservation
> of life
> Science is a means of invigorating the
> self.[31]

Yet Iqbal believes that "religion is not a departmental affair: it is neither mere thought, nor mere feeling, nor mere action; it is an expression of the whole man." There is no reason to suppose, he argues, that thought and intuition are essentially opposed to each other. Springing up from the same root, they complement each other:

> The one grasps Reality piecemeal, the other grasps it in its wholeness. The one fixes its gaze on the eternal, the other on the temporal aspect of Reality. The one is present enjoyment of the

---

[30] D. T. Suzuki, "An Introduction: A Glimpse of Paul Carus," J. M. Kitagawa, ed., Modern Trends in World Religions, p. x.

[31] Quoted in Schimmel's Gabriel's Wing, p. 133.

> whole of Reality; the other aims at traversing the whole by slowly specifying and closing up the various regions of the whole for exclusive observation. Both are in need of each other for mutual rejuvenation. Both seek vision: of the same Reality which reveals itself to them in accordance with their function in life. In fact, intuition as Bergson rightly says, is only a higher kind of intellect.[32]

Thus, all three men seem to have a metaphysic, vague though it may be. Buber writes in response to Charles Hartshorne's "Martin Buber's Metaphysics":[33] "You begin, dear Hartshorne, with the sentence, I am no metaphysician and I am one of the greatest metaphysicians. After attentive reading of your essay, I am far more strongly yet convinced than at the beginning of the reading, that we can make only the first half of your sentence the basis for an understanding."[34]

Yes to the end of his days, Buber denied having a metaphysics. If metaphysics means a system of doctrines and beliefs about the nature of being, a system which can be classified with one tradition or the other enabling one to pinpoint the specific beliefs and doctrines, then I see no disagreement with Buber. On the other hand, Pfeutze appears to be right in stating that Buber has a "theistic understanding of the structure of the universe in which to place his understanding of me, and he insists upon a wider context of relatedness. ..."[35] Personally, I find some glimpses of light in Buber's words:

---

[32] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, pp. 2-3.

[33] Philosophy of Martin Buber, pp. 49-68.

[34] Ibid., p. 717.

> I must say it once again: I have no teaching. I only point to something. I point to reality, I point to something in reality that had not or had too little been seen. I take him who listens to me by the hand and lead him to the window. I open the window and point to what is outside. I have no teaching, but I carry on a conversation.[36]

Iqbal certainly had a metaphysics, and he does not deny having one.[37] His theistic conception of the structure of the universe and man's relation to God, which also shows his whole attitude toward the problem of mysticism, is described in a simple verse:

Mardan-i khuda khuda nabashand
likan zi khuda juda nabashand
The men of God do not become God
but they are never separated from God.[38]

As far as Suzuki is concerned, I think he would not nod his head to what Buber and Iqbal have said. Arguing that Zen is not explainable by mere intellectual analysis,[39]

---

[35] Pfeutze, Self, Society and Existence, p. 231.

[36] Philosophy of Martin Buber, p. 693.

[37] In addition to his books of poems, Iqbal's only prose, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, is a clear guide of his metaphysics.

[38] Quoted in Schimmel, Gabriel's Wing, p. 376.

[39] Suzuki, Studies in Zen, "Zen: A Reply to Dr. Hu Shih," p. 136.

Suzuki holds that only one of the two types of mentality can fathom the meaning of Zen, namely "the one which can understand Zen, and therefore, has the right to say something about it."[40] Since I cannot presume to have the right understanding of Zen, let me quote Suzuki in presenting a sort of metaphysical statement (although Suzuki might object to my using this method):

> For instance, when you ask whether Zen is a philosophy or a religious faith, we cannot say it is either, as far as we understand these two terms in their usual sense. Zen has no thought-system of its own; it liberally uses Mahayana terminology; it refuses to commit itself to any specified pattern of thinking. Nor is it a faith, for it does not urge us to accept any dogma or creed or an object of worship. It is true that it has temples and monasteries where images of the Buddhas and Bodhisattbas (would-be Buddhas) are enshrined in some specially sanctified quarters, but the monks do not hesitate to treat them unceremoniously when they find it more useful for the elucidation of their subject matter. What the Zen masters stress most is a certain kind of experience, and this experience is to express itself in ways most characteristic of Zen. Those ways, they consider, constitute the essential features of Zen as differentiated from the other schools of Buddhism, as well as from all religious or philosophical thought-systems of the world. What modern students of Zen have to do is to make a thorough examination of Zen-experience itself and of the ways in which the experience has expressed itself in history.[41]

Suzuki may not welcome my attributing him a metaphysical view, but I find some encouragement from Smith[42] when he writes that Mahayana from which Zen Buddhism finds its roots elaborates metaphysics. Furthermore Charles A. Moore in his article "Metaphysics and Ethics in East and West,"[43] points out the relationship of metaphysics and ethics: "...the transcendence of ethical values and norms by the one who has achieved wisdom -- spiritual realization, prajna, enlightenment. This concept can best be understood by thinking of it along with the metaphysical doctrine of transcendence of all empirical qualities."[44]

---

[40] Suzuki, Studies in Zen, "Zen: A Reply to Dr. Hu Shih," p. 135.

[41] Ibid.; see also Suzuki, Zen Buddhism, pp. 257-75.

Indeed, there are some differences. And I cannot claim impartiality and objectivity in trying to present their views. And in my attempt to understand each man's views and to discuss the same with my accompanying critical judgements, I try to be fair to all men, though one will easily detect where my sympathies lie.

Having said this, we are now ready to see where and what each man finds in common with one another. Later we may see where each differs.

SIMILARITIES

The Social Self and The Temple of One's Soul

Man is a social self living in a world of relations and experiences. John Donne in his Devotions Xll writes: "No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of a maine; if a clod be washed away by the Sea, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a Promonterie were, as well as if a Manner of thy friends or of thine owne were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankinde; and therefore never send to know for whom the Bell tolls; It tolls for thee." Surely he was writing not only for his times, but also for this twentieth century. Relation, this is the main point of Buber,Suzuki and Iqbal. In the beginning is relation, Buber, emphazies, for "all real living is meeting."[45] Within the social realm, through the interplay of gesture and reply, address and response, claim and counter-claim, argument and debate, more especially by means of words, the human being comes into an awareness of himself and becomes truly human. To be truly himself, man needs others, and his essential nature is fulfilled in his relations to other human beings and to other things.

---

[42] Smith, The Religions of Man, p. 138

[43] Essays in East-West Philosophy, pp. 398-424.

[44] Ibid., p. 420.

All three men emphasize this relation, on the other hand, they point out that "everything depends on oneself."[46]

---

[45] Buber, I and Thou, p. 11. See John Magee. Religion and Modern Man,(New York: Harper & Row,1967), pp. 483-493 on the need for communion. This section has an explanation on the many forms and meanings of love.

[46] Buber, The Way of Man, p. 28.

Challenged to decide to straighten oneself out, man is reminded of one sage's advice: "Seek peace in your own place." Buber explaims further:

> You cannot find peace anywhere save in your own self. In the psalm we read: "Theme is no peace in my bones because of my sin." When a man has made peace within himself, he will be able to make peace in the whole world.[47]

"Man should himself realize that conflict situations between himself and others are nothing but the effects of conflict-situations in his own soul,"[48] Buber observes. Later he should try to overcome this inner conflict by finding his way from the casual, accessory elements of his existence to his own self (not the trivial ego of the egotistic individual), and then go out to his fellow-men and enter into a new, transformed relationship with them.

The gatha of four lines "... direct pointing at the soul of man, and seeing into one's nature and the attainment of Buddhahood,"[49] which is the essence of Zen Buddhism supports Buber's suggestion to "begin with oneself." Hui-neng joins Buber in this regard when advising Ming who came to obtain the faith, he replied: "In what I have shown to thee there is nothing hidden. If thou reflectest within thyself and recognizist thine own face, which was before the world, secrecy is in thyself."[50] Suzuki opines: "The self knows itself from within and never from the outside."[51]

---

[47] Buber, The Way of Man, p. 29.

[48] Ibid., p. 28.

[49] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, Vol. 1, p. 176.

Iqbal, who believes that man not only from the biological but also from the spiritual point of view is the result of immense periods of development, has this to say:

> Look upon thyself and do not be anxious
> because of thy void shirt,
> For in Thy breast a full moon is concealed.[52]

Iqbal suggests that in order to change an unfavorable environment, one must undergo a complete transformation of his inner being. Iqbal has put forth his and Buber's theistic understanding:

> God changeth not the condition of a people until they themselves take the initiative to change their condition by constantly illuminating the Zone of their daily activity in the light of a definite ideal. Nothing can be achieved without a firm faith in the independence of one's own inner life. This faith alone keeps a people's eye fixed on their goal and saves them from perpetual vacillation.... The flame of life cannot be borrowed from others; it must be kindled in the temple of one's soul.[53]

Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal find echoes of their thoughts and correlations with some interpretations[54] of the biblical statement: "The Kingdom of God is within you," as they consider this "candle of individuality," the glow of which, according to Iqbal, the light of God increases. Suzuki may not like the theistic overtones of this assertion, yet I think he supports Buber and Iqbal on the "secrecy in oneself." All three men join forces with psychologist and psychoanalysts in calling our attention to that "inner region which is as dark and unexplored as Dr. Livingston's Africa into which the most well meaning prayer cannot penetrate without a map, a guide."[55]

---

[50] Suzuki, Studies in Zen, p. 18.

[51] Suzuki, et al., Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 28.

[52] Quoted in Schimmel, Gabriel's Wing, p. 109.

[53] Iqbal, Speeches and Statements ..., pp. 52-56.

Socrates' famous challenge "know thyself" is timely indeed. It is even more explicitly stated by Jesus, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." And the Nazarene refers here not freedom from chaos and pin pricks of life, but of freedom from the chains and whips of fear, tension, uncertainty, anxiety that keep us in an emotional and mental prison and rob us of the potentialities for relationship, creativeness, goodness and love.[56]

---

[54] See Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. F. L. Crows (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 768-69 for the escathological meaning as well as for the Kingdom of God as a present reality in each of us, Matt. 3:2, 4:17; Matt. 12:18; Luke 17:21. The article: "The Kingdom of God," Ibid., pp. 768-69 specifically cites at least three meanings for this Kingdom of God which is at hand or in you (Matt. 2:2, 4:17) ... is upon you (Matt. 12:28); and in the midst of you (Luke 17:21).

[55] William Parker and St. Johns, Prayer Can Change Your Life (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1964), p. 48.

Another important and relevant facet of this "candle of this individuality" is the understanding of man as an indivisible unit, a single whole. I see no trace of body-soul dualism. Buber, Iqbal and Suzuki see man as an integral and indissoluble unity, more readily portrayed as an en-souled body than a duality of soul and body. More particularly, Iqbal and Buber maintain that man's life as a whole is the creation of a good God. In this day and age when everything is classified, and man himself is considered one among the mass of things, an atom in a formula, a sample of the universe, or a "servant of superior values,"[57] Buber's, Iqbal's and Suzuki's words are like a soft cool breeze on a hot day. Iqbal is aware of the age-old symbol of the soul-bird or that man is dust, but when the seed cleaves the dust, it becomes a fresh rose. On the whole though he opines that body and soul form a unity and must not be separated unduly -- body is the veil of the soul but is indispensable for its development and preservation. He writes:

---

[56] For a psychological explanation on why we learn not how to know the truth about ourselves, see Parker, Prayer Can Change Your Life, pp. 480-88. For cultural approach, see Henry Jules, Culture Against Man (New York: Random House, 1963). "Knowing Thyself" must naturally include 'Know Thy Fear'", p. 477.

[57] R. Calhoun, What is Man (Connecticut: Hazen Foundation Inc., USA, 1941).

> Yet grows the soul more salient through
> the flesh,
> Our dagger's whetted by its scabbard there.[58]

Buber's reference to Hasidic teaching on envisaging man as a whole is now well-known. Man's essential unity extends even in the hallowing of lived life to the natural and social life,[59] quite similar to Iqbal's view on the inseparability of temporal and religious life. Buber quotes the Scripture (Genesis 17:1) to even to these "loving" him (Isaiah 41:8): "Be whole."

Socrates in his Apology inscribed over all subsequent philosophy: "The unexamined life is not worth lifing." And the three men have their respective suggestions, guidelines, directives, and rules, stages or processes of examining oneself, but since we cannot discuss all these, it must be emphasized here that each thinker calls urgently for the need of self-knowledge and self-examination.

While Buber's previous injunction was to begin with oneself for the "Self knows itself from within and never from the outside"[60] as Suzuki reasons, Buber along with

---

[58] Quoted in Schimmel, Gabriel's Wing, p. 94. See also Iqbal's The Reconstruction of the Religious Thought in Islam, p. 100; Iqbal's The Secrets of the Self, XX.

[59] Philosophy of Martin Buber, pp. 732, 724. Perhaps Harvey Cox needs to read this in connection with his suggestion of an I-You, Secular City (New York: Harper and Row, 1965).

[60] Suzuki, et al., Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 28.

Iqbal and Suzuki advises us not to end with oneself, nor aim at oneself. Yes comprehend yourself, but not to be preoccupied with oneself. Worry not about what you have done wrong, but "apply the soul power you are now wasting on self-approach, to such active relationship to the world as you are destined for."[61] In the word of Buber's I and Thou, have an I-Thou relation. And, of course, this I-Thou relation can only be indicated or pointed in words and experienced in direct personal relations.

Fromm, in his book The Art of Loving,[62] lends support to this quality of respect for and affirmation of personality. Over against unselfishness (as the expression of masochistic self-contempt and self-hatred) and selfishness (self-centeredness rooted in self-hatred and self-rejection), Fromm states that "genuine love is rooted in self-love -- genuine affirmation and respect for oneself as a person"[63] a thou with all the rights, privileges and prerogatives of a person. Only when one can love himself in this way can he learn to love and accept his neighbor as oneself.

I think it is this insight on "Being Whole," or straightening oneself out," or "loving oneself," or "the secrecy in oneself" of Buber,[64] Iqbal, and Suzuki, which touched upon the core of the deepest and most problems of our life: "the true origin of conflict between man and man."[65]

---

[61] Buber, The Way of Man, p. 32.

[62] Erich Fromm, The Art of Loving (Boston: Beacon Press).

[63] J. Hutchison, Faith, Reason and Existence, p. 77. See also Tillich, Love, Power and Justice.

It is to the credit of Zen Buddhism in general and Suzuki in particular that we have been more challenged to rediscover the wealth within ourselves. And I think it is this ~~particular~~ aspect of Zen Buddhism which fascinates the Western people who are so other-directed, physically active and work-conscious. Suzuki, in spite of his apparent difficulties in presenting Zen with his constant use of Western terminologies and means of systematization, and seeming sense of superiority complex succeeded in pointing out that the "ultimate authority of Zen faith is within oneself and not from without."[66]

---

[64] Pfeutze, in his attempt to compare Buber with Mead with an end in view of stressing the key note of both men on Relation, forgot Buber's emphasis on beginning with one self. Friedman (Martin Buber, Life of Dialogue) another commentator of Buber is aware, it seems, of this point, but I don't think he sees the great importance of the same. Diamond helped in a way in exposing Buber as an existentialist. Perhaps a psychologically oriented writer or scholar can be a better guide in pointing out the main significance of starting first with oneself in order to be able to stand in relation with the world and people.

[65] For a modern application of the importance of beginning with oneself, see Thompson, Jean, The House of Tomorrow (New York: Harper and Row, 1967). "All what I want is an ability to get along with myself and the world. Stability. How I used to hate that word. Now I want it. Stability-continuity-Stick-to-it-ness, not to give up." p. 138.

Zen both as a theory and technique to achieve "enlightenment" points out what is already within oneself and what the Zen master does is no more than to point it out for man so that he can see it more plainly than before. The efforts are directed to bring man in relation with Being or Life which animates all things and feel its pulsation as when the eye comes in touch with light it recognizes it as light.[67]

The emphasis of Zen on actual personal experience of the disciple in his study, self-training and daily life testifies to the importance of discovering his true self-nature.

Drawing upon the categories of Novak, we have a glimpse of this true-self, because of our "first awareness." Distinguishing "first awareness" from "the second awareness", the recondite, analytic, and usually verbal, Novak explains that

> first awareness is thus the cognitive act most proper and intimate to a person, assuring him of his own identity through all the range of his actions, and it is, among cognitive acts, sui generis. It is subjective yet cognitive; private, yet common to every person; accessible to every man for verfication in himself, and utterly indispensable in other cognitive act. ... Primarily

---

[66] Suzuki, Studies in Zen, p. 28.

[67] Suzuki, et al., Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 28.

> and above all, the experience of a subjectivity is cognitive; but it is not easily expressed in a language created for our use in living among objects.[68]

Novak believes that a human being is a person before he can speak. He is aware (first aware) of himself as a subject, a person,[69] before he is "second aware" of himself as an object. In our subject-object theories, we often recognize second awareness before adverting to first awareness. Only through language, only through an I-Thou dialogue, can one become a person as Buber distinguishes an "individual", i.e., one who dwells only in an I-It world from the "person", i.e., one who encounters another subject with his whole being. Man awakens to himself only through a meeting with another as other; he is taught to articulate and thereby enabled to differentiate himself from the world. As Mead suggests, it is through language that man comes to understand his relation to the world of things and persons as one conscious person among many. "But even in the encounter between speakers," Novak insists, "the subjectivity of each is prior to verbal communication, and whatever understanding is to be achieved through words depends on the stage of comprehension to which the subjects have become alert."[70]

---

[68] Michael Novak, Belief and Unbelief (New York: New American Library, 1967), p. 75. See J. Brown, Kierkegaard, Heideggar, Buber and Barth, for the difference between subjects of the meeting and of natural knowledge, p. 169.

[69] Ibid., p. 76.

Novak, anticipating Buber's potential I or potential Thou, answers the question, Who am I? with this deep conviction:

> At least this: I am a self, conscious and alert. I have an abiding awareness of my own identity, which I can neglect in the divertissement of daily living, or I can advert to this awareness often and make it the central, guiding experience of my inner life. I can forget, or I can remember.[71]

Briefly, man, before he becomes aware of himself as one living in the worlds of I-Thou and of I-It and who can even talk of the Zen approach to reality, is a subject who is "first aware" of his true-self-nature, an original subject.[72] Constantly he needs to be reminded of his identity, his subjectivity; and one, who has attained the "moments of no time", is enlightened; he is no longer dualistic and scientific in his daily living and outlooks in life. First awareness in its fulness unifies senses, imagination, inquiry, insight, decision, activity and enjoyment of success or acknowledgement of failure."[73] He "lives" invariably a personal life.[74]

---

[70] Novak, *Belief and Unbelief*, p. 77.

[71] *Ibid*., p. 77.

[72] *The Eastern Buddhist*, Vol. I, pp. 42-43.

[73] *Ibid*., p. 73.

[74] Suzuki, et al., *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis*, p. 25.

The Participant and His Positive Attitudes Toward Life

Man, to Buber, Iqbal, and Suzuki, is a participant and a knower in the playground of life who knows and lives the life of the other in an active give-and-take relationship. Suzuki's example of Chiyo, a poetess who wrote haikus, reminds us of Zen's aesthetic appreciation of nature's beauties and a Zennist's affirmative acceptance of life:

> Oh, the morning glory
> The bucket made captive
> I beg for water.[75]

Life is too good, there is joy in living in this world. Buber and Iqbal may even go further in exclaiming with Rabbi Pinchas of Korets who is quoted as saying:

> Joy exists upon a higher stage than sorrow. Even a newborn infant weeps at first, only later does it also laugh. For then it has already attained a higher stage. Joy wells from higher worlds; from the aureole of God. Therefore too, joy washes all sins away.[76]

The dialogic man, the Zen man, and the Man of Faith find man's hope in his capacity to give and take in the highways and byways of life with living things and human beings;

---

[75] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism..., p. 271.

[76] Quoted in Schoeps, Hans-Joachin, The Religions of Mankind, 1966, p. 221.

and they assert that the mightiest of efforts should be made, through social institutions and personal encounters, to develop this unique capacity of man. In the give-and-take meeting of people, there is risk, a wager. Man makes some choice, some decision in what he is and does, if not in what he believes or thinks, for not to decide is a decision, not to choose is a choice.[77] And certainly Buber's, Iqbal's, and Suzuki's man actively involve themselves in the arena of life and its activities for each moment the cosmic croupier cries out, "Faites vous jeux" - make your bets.[78] Believing in the here-and-now of life, Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal concur with Kierkegaard on the now-moment of decision:

> The instant is really the decision of eternity. The divine decision which is unique and without equal, though realizing itself in time, becomes precisely the instant. Where an occasion and its effect tally as in the case of the cry in the desert and its echo, there the instant does not appear, but its souvenir glues itself in the eternity of the instant. The instant is born rightly of the rapport of the eternal decision with its unparallelled uniqueness.[79]

In sum, Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal are positing the real existence of the other who in concrete lived-life relationship lays a claim upon us and encounters us in relationship through language and symbolic gesture. Along with other scientists, they insist upon a real knowledge of a real world, a real other over against oneself. Oneself is not only an object of another, neither is the other one's object of thought or legal knowledge. He is a subject (Novak's first awareness of being a person or Suzuki's original subject) aware of himself as a subject, but also a subject "becoming aware" of a real other, a thou. Neither I nor thou alone but I and Thou, self and another, is the basic principle of human living and true nature of reality.

---

[77] Eckstein, "The Fall and Rise of Man," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. V, I, Fall 1965, 68-81.

[78] W. G. Cole, The Restless Quest of Modern Man (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 107.

[79] Quoted in Vedanta Kesari (Golden Number), Vol. LI, No. 1, May 1964, 35-40.

Self and Society

In the beginning relation is, writes Buber.[80] In the words of Iqbal, it is written:

> To an individual attachment to a group
> is a blessing.
> His potential worth attains perfection
> from the group.
> When an individual identifies himself
> with a group.
> The drop in its quest for expansion
> becomes an ocean.
> In isolation the individual is unaware
> of objectives.
> His strength is prone to disintegration.[81]

---

[80] Buber, I and Thou, p. 18.

[81] Quoted in The Pakistan Review, Vol. XIV, 4, April 1966, 12.

A community of selves is necessary to elicit and shape new minds and selves. The more one is actively involved in his group, the more he is able to gauge the social will and act accordingly yet responsibly. Zen is socially-minded as much as any other religion, Suzuki argues, but this has been demonstrated more individualistically because of its emphasis upon individual experience. As far as serving others in social ways, Zen has had its own unique fashion of doing it.

Such phrases as "in the market place," "in the middle of the crossroads," which means busily involved in all kinds of work, or "the face smeared with dirt and the head covered with ashes" are abundant in Zen literature. As mentioned in Chapter III, Zen does not despise manual labor; in fact it is through and during the everyday activities that one attains satori. In "The Ten Cow-herding Pictures," the last scene, man is coming into the market place. The market place like the agora of the Greeks contrasts with the mountain or summer retreat, the former is the institution or meeting place where a man works out with others solutions for the problems of society while the latter is a haven of self-training, meditation and rest from public work. The Zen man "helps all people to cross the stream of birth and death." And the "monastery is not meant just to be a hiding place from the worries of the world; on the contrary, it is a training station where man equips himself for life's battlefield, that is, to do all that can possibly be done for his community."[82]

In Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal, the social-ethical element is predominant. The community is a genuine society, "an association of cooperating persons, meeting each other face to face in common toil and reciprocal government."[83] The central idea of a monk's life is to make the best possible use of things as they are given us, which is all for the unfolding and enhancing of the highest powers possessed by us.[84] Iqbal writes: "It is the lot of man to share in his deeper aspirations of the universe around him and to shape his own destiny as well as that of the universe. And in this process of progressive change, God becomes a co-worker with him, provided man takes the initiative."[85] He is more explicit than Buber who prescribes no books of principles and systems of ethics but "everyone should accept moral prescriptions whatever helps him to go the way."[86] Iqbal cites the definite mission on earth of the human personality in three directions, as mentioned in Chapter IV. His answer to the question on how this evolutionary stage in three directions is attained is by fortifying personality or Ego. The following factors and forces, which are abundantly clear in a study of Iqbal's works, fortify human personality: (1) courage, (2) tolerance, (3) love, (4) living on lawful means, (5) supreme indifference to the rewards the world has to offer, (6) taking part in original and creative activities, (7) freedom. Love is the regenerating spirit of the Universe, a spirit that should cut the Gordian knot of all man's perplexities and provides an antidote to all human vices. Like Suzuki, Iqbal insists on _faqr_ -- which is disdain for the rewards which this world, or the next, has to offer. Laying great stress on the development of tolerance, Iqbal says "the principle of the Ego-sustaining deed is respect for the Ego in myself as well as in others.

---

[82] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism, p. 274.

[83] The Philosophy of Martin Buber, p. 473.

[84] Suzuki, Introduction to Zen Buddhism, pp. 1-122.

[85] Quoted in Pirzada, S., "Iqbal's Concept of Self," The Pakistan Review, Vol. XIV, No. 4, April 1966.

[86] The Philosophy of Martin Buber, p. 718.

> Humanity consists in respect for Man
> So acquaint thyself with the dignity of man.[87]

In other words, the individual grows to personhood in an intensely social process. He is always born into a group which has a culture. At birth there is the first-awareness of one's subjectivity as Novak points out, and a potentiality of socialization in every individual or the inborn Thou, "a priori of relation,"[88] in Buber's terms.

---

[87] Quoted in Pirzada's "Iqbal's Concept of Self," p. 12.

[88] Buber, _I and Thou_, pp. 27-28, 9-10, 14-15.

Modes of Communication and Speech

All three communicate their thought and take it as their task to do so. Each has a message to proclaim; and each communicates it with a great sense of mission.

Like Jesus and Socrates, they move among men in the streets and on the highroads, struggling with them on life's issues, exchanging questions and answers, expounding their doctrines or pointing the way.

They have different ways of communicating their message. Iqbal speaks of the purpose of poetry in the following lines:

> If the subject of poetry is to build up man,
> The poet is in direct lineage with the
> prophets.[89]

The pivot on which his poetry revolves is the view of man. Man, to Iqbal, is the supreme creation, sought after by even God Himself.

While Buber employs tales, especially those of Hasidic origin and of autobiographical fragments, Suzuki relies heavily on stories, anecdotes and sayings of Zen masters of both the Chinese and Japanese ancestry. All three see the value of the written and verbal words; more than this they use natural objects, bodily movements and common occurrences. "Form's silent asking, man's loving speech, the mute proclamation of the creature, are all gates leading into the presence of the word."[90] In another saying: "... that in God's response everything, the universe, is made manifest as language."[91] The silent eloquent smile of Mahakasyapa marked an important event in Buddhist history. On the other hand, Master Rinzai warns: "in all these, do not get yourself entangled with any object, but stand above, pass on and be free."[92] The sixth Patriarch joins him in reminding us that the deviced methods are not part of Zen: "If I tell you that I have a system of Law to transmit to others I am cheating you. What I do to my disciples is to liberate them from their own bondage with such devices as the case may need."[93]

---

[89] Quoted in Kamal, "Iqbal's Concept of Man," p. 31.

In the thought of Buber, Iqbal and possibly Suzuki, speech[94] is central to the origin and development of personhood. Dialogues and consultation of Zen disciples with their masters, Buber's socratic fashion of one man with other, Iqbal's evolutionary stages in three directions point to these three men's need and use of speech. For Buber especially, speech is creative at two different levels which are for man and for God. Let Pfeutze explain this: On the human level Buber's meaning may be conveyed by using the analogy of spirit as a kind of magnetic field. In the world of I-It the magnetic lines of force are broken or neutralized. When the "Thou" is truly spoken, the two centers or poles of force bring about a magnetic field. "Spirit" is, then, analogous to the lines of magnetic force lying "between."[95]

---

[90] Buber, I and Thou, p. 102.

[91] Ibid., p. 103.

[92] Quoted in Humphreys' Zen Buddhism, pp. 183-185.

[93] Idem.

[94] For comparison of two spheres (man and nature) around which relation arises, see Philosophy of Martin Buber, pp. 707-09; I and Thou, "Postscript." See Hutchison, Faith, Reason and Existence, p. 68.

Buber brings to our attention the creative and constitutive role of speech. It is not a matter of acoustic but of attitude and direction of being. Speech is the bridge between two poles, the act by which the potential between the two poles becomes actualized in a self. Being is not just being known (in Berkeley's terms), but being addressed, answering, knowing that one is known."[96] Speech is full of address and response, claim and promise. Furthermore, Buber regards speech as "an event which grasps beyond the existence of mankind and the world."[97] Each moment is address and answer. "The world is given to the human beings who perceive it, and the life of man is itself a dialogue --"[98]

---

[95] Pfeutze, Self, Society, Existence, p. 257; James Brown, Subject and Object in Modern Theology (New York: Colher Books, 1959), p. 108.

[96] Ibid., p. 236.

[97] Buber, Israel and the World, p. 16.

[98] Idem.

taking and accepting, claiming and responding.

All three men have a concern as they communicate what they have to proclaim. And their concern is not just a file of information and facts, but a transformation in man's thinking and inward action. They read the innermost soul of other men, both on theoretical and practical foundation. They are aware that they are speaking to the profound inwardness that preceeds all action and deeds. Their message is, they believe, grounded in an absolute which may be called being, eternity, transcendent one, or an order demonstrated in the archetypes but which ceases to be its own authentic self the moment it is treated scientifically.

Community: The Social as Moral

One primary aspiration of history is a genuine community of human beings. A community must be based on the actual and communal life of big and little groups living and worshipping together, and on their mutual relationships. To form this kind of society that makes possible the nurturing of genuine community, Buber believes, is a religious task because it is only in genuine community that the life of dialogue can take place. At one point, Buber opines that in religious socialism man in the concreteness of his personal life takes seriously the fundamentals of life -- there is God and His world, and that he, this human person, stands before God and in the world.

It is in Part 111, "Politics,Community and Peace," of his book, Pointing The Way, that Buber seems to give us his view on true social responsibility. He says that it is the responsibility of demarcation line--not a hard and fast,tightly defined moral law, but the "up to here and no further" that must be drawn ever anew by the individual and community through "hourly acting with a continually renewed sense of responsibility". Neither the morality of the compulsory order and compulsory good, nor the morality of absolute partition and liberal perfectionism or any of the "isms" which refer back to the concrete historical situation is Buber's view of morality. This is one of the areas where it is hard to explain what Buber really means. I can only refer to what and how he understands community--the basis of which is on the reality of the "interhuman", the sphere of direct,mutual relations between man and man, the genuine dialogue in which each allows the other to exist in his otherness and respond to him in his wholeness and uniqueness. In another sentence characteristic of Buber, "in the most powerful moments of dialogue, where in truth 'deep calls unto deep'it becomes unmistakably clear that it is not the wand of the individual or of the social, but of a third which draws the circle round the happening. On the far side of the subjective, on this side of the objective, on the narrow ridge, where I and Thou meet, there is the realm of 'between'."[99]

Unlike Buber, Iqbal has a definite view of the community; and he specifically mentions the requirements. Fear, beggary, slavery, pride of stock or extraction are influences and factors which lead to the weakening of the Ego. Asking dependence on others, a slavish invitation of ideas and culture of others are what Iqbal thinks of beggary. These weaken the Ego, and only when the individual or community develop self-reliance and evolve on great richness of their own being, can their natural gifts improve and enhance. Iqbal writes:

> Enslaved life is reduced to a small rivulet
> Free, it is like the boundless ocean
> In slavery the heart is killed in the body.
> In slavery the soul becomes a burden to
>   the body.
> In slavery the community is disunited.[100]

In short, Iqbal believes that an ideal society must be based on spiritual consideration like Monotheism, with an inspired leadership or brotherhood as its centre, a definite code for its guidance, and clear goal. Gaining supremacy over the forces of nature Iqbal's ideal society must safeguard maternity. The communal or collective Ego must be developed in the same way as the individual Ego is developed. Yes,

---

[99] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 204; see Philosophy of Martin Buber, p. 723.

[100] Quoted in Prisada, "Iqbal's Concept of Self," The Pakistan Review, April 1966.

Iqbal is interested not only in the individual and his self-realization, but he is equally concerned with the evolution of an ideal society. Only as a member of his community that the individual, through and with the twin principles of harmony and discord, is able to realize himself fully. Only a community which is an association of self-asserting individuals can come into being and can perfect itself.

Suzuki, quite similar to Buber, asserts that what Zen proposes is this: "To seek enlightenment for oneself and to help others attain it. There are six cardinal virtues of the Zen-man, namely Charity, precepts, humility, energy, meditation and wisdom."[101]

Man and God as Correlative Concepts

Both in Buber's and Iqbal's views of reality, the correlative or polar concepts,[102] man and God seem applicable. Following John Calvin, "true and substantial wisdom principally consists of two parts, the knowledge of God and the knowledge of ourselves." Let us cite some poetic lines of Iqbal and Buber to show how each employs the two polar concepts. The following lines are descriptive of man's creative genius which turns God's handiwork into things different and more meaningful.

---

[101] Suzuki, et al., Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, pp. 72-76.

[102] Morris, Cohen, Reason and Nature (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1931), p. 165. See Hutchison, Faith, Reason and Existence, p. 63.

> Thou didst create the night and I
> made the lamp
> Thou didst make clay and I made the cup.
> Thou didst create the deserts, mountains
> and forests,
> I made flower beds, rose gardens and
> groves.[103]

Again, Iqbal affirms the higher status of a man with intuitive vision and scientific knowledge. In a lyrical poem Iqbal says that God lost man and is now everywhere.

> We are lost to God and He is seeking us;
> He is, like us, the captive of love
> and desire.[104]

In answer to the question: What is the source of self?, Iqbal holds that it is God whose nearness gives perfection to the self:

> Get secluded from everyone and seek the company of the knower. Seek the self through God and God through the self.[105]

Buber says that God is not to be met in some special place but in the concreteness of the everyday:

> If you explore the life of things and of conditioned being you come to the unfathomable, if you deny the life of things and of conditional being, you stand before nothingness, if you hallow this life you meet the living God.[106]

---

[103] Quoted in Kamal, *Iqbal's Concept of Man*, p. 45.

[104] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

[105] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[106] Buber, *I and Thou*, p. 79.

God is "in this world" as the source of personal being and its depth. In our human I-Thou relationship, we also meet God.

> Every particular Thou is a glimpse through to the eternal Thou; by means of every particular Thou the primary word addresses the eternal Thou. Through this mediation of the Thou of all being fulfillment, and non-fulfillment, of relations comes to them; the inborn Thou is realized in each relation and consummated in none. It is consummated only in the direct relation with the Thou that by its nature cannot become It.[107]

It may appear that there are no gods in Buddhism the way we understand the word 'God' in the Judeo-Christian tradition. However, Ross in his lectures on World Religions helps me in my doubt about the existence of God, gods and value when he said: "Mahayana has gods galore! In all forms of Buddhism there are value assumptions." Suzuki's words are: "Zen is a way from bondage to freedom, liberating our natural energies and impelling us to express our faculty for happiness and love."[108]

Silence and nonknowledge

Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal know silence and put great emphasis on it -- especially in their individual ways of communicating their message. With an intense desire to help and enlighten the modern man, they struggle to explicate what they have found revealing, relevant and authentic in their own individual personal lives and their thoughts. On the other hand their profoundest truth can be communicated only indirectly even to themselves, finding echoes in their own personal life. They speak in tales, parables, poems, stories and others, finding themselves silent at certain times, purposedly keeping quiet to answer questions they regard as inappropriate. Buber and Suzuki and possibly Iqbal are the least interested in metaphysical discussion or the science of nature.

---

[107] Buber, I and Thou, p. 75.

[108] Ross in our class and in private tutoring periods explained the existence of gods and value. I hope I quoted him accurately here. See Suzuki, Zen Buddhism, p. 3.

All have demonstrated their insistence on their non-knowledge.[109] Where knowledge is not attainable, they waste no time on fruitless and unnecessary questioning and meditation. Aware of the risk involved in an intense and fully authentic life, they try to answer in their own lives with silence yet with hope for man's openness to what is coming. In silence and non-knowledge of other large realms, they live out their message; trusting that:

> In the infinite language of events and situations, eternally changing, but plain to the truly attentive, transcendence speaks to our hearts at the essential moments of personal life. And there is a language in which we can answer it; it is the language of one's actions and attitudes, our reactions and abstentions; the totality of these answers is what

---

[109] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, p. 4.

we may call one answering, and for ourselves in the most proper sense of the expression.[110]

---

[110] Buber, At the Turning (Farrar, Straus and Young Inc., 1952), p. 127.

CHAPTER VI

A SUMMARY AND SOME CONCLUSIONS

Goethe's last words are "More Light." In our attempt to identify ideas on personhood and review the ways in which three men have helped to point out the problems of the human being, we are continuously urged to look for "more light" from and in relation with the "world, and men, and spiritual beings." In Buber's, Iqbal's and Suzuki's thoughts are three foci in which the concept of social person comes to definitive and persuasive, if not always consistent, expression.

Buber,[1] Iqbal, and Suzuki who come from three different lands, speaking different languages, trained in different religious traditions can talk to each other. And one point of mutual conversation and interest is on What is Man? Man, to Iqbal, is the supreme creation, sought after even by God Himself. There are some evidences of agreement between Suzuki's preoccupation with the true self-nature and Buber's interest and study of man especially in these days of "the depersonalization of man."

---

[1] Iqbal's message is addressed only to Muslim as Raju (p. 382) points out but the application is to all. (Schimmel, p. 87 concurs.) Buber, though he is of Jewish origin and primarily relying on the Hasidic tales and materials in his exposition of his ideas, has a message that runs deep transcending beyond his cultural and religious learnings and origins. Suzuki's message is not only deeply rooted in Chinese-Japanese cultural and historical foundations, but it seems universally workable.

We may now, in this concluding chapter, endeavor to gather the strands of thoughts, survey the path we have come, and indicate some remaining difficulties. For this purpose, may we list some guidelines to sum up these three men's conclusions.

Man and His Existence

All have accepted as a given datum the fact of man and of his existence; man is real, existent, actual. They began where they are, as Charles Sanders Pierce once aptly remarked. And in following this suggestion, they have appealed to science. The scientific method treats man as an object, a thing to be examined and classified. Man is just a thing among things "which thinged man," as Chuang-tse sanely said. All three men have studied man as an object of their thought and writing. And they found the importance of this method. Buber's I-It, subject-object relation, which is the realm of *experience* and *use*, is his exact term for this scientific method. Man, he says, cannot live in this world without this I-It relation. Without the I-It relation no earthly persistence of human existence is conceivable.[2] Iqbal's definition of science shows points of similarities to Buber's view. Iqbal writes: "Science is an instrument for the preservation of Life."[3] In spite of Iqbal's personal inclination towards the element of love and his condemnation of pure intellect, the poet-philosopher tries to maintain the essential unity of the different aspects of life as revealed in the pair of contrasting manifestations. Suzuki (among the three men we have been studying) seems to be depreciating the scientific method, although he uses extensively the scientific way as a background in presenting the Zen approach to reality. "The sciences deal with abstractions and there is no activity in them. Zen plunges itself into the source of creativity and drinks from it all the life there is in it."[4] "While the scientists murder, the artist attempts to create."[5] Suzuki disapproves of the scientific way, the subject-object way of viewing life, but he cannot delete it from his lectures and presentation of the Zen approach.

---

[2] Buber, *I and Thou*, pp. 34, 46; see also *Philosophy of Martin Buber*, p. 716.

On the other hand, while realizing the role of the scientific method and perhaps being grateful for what it does for man, all these men warn about the dominance of I-It, the worship of it as a god. "The I-It relation, gigantically swollen, has usurped the mastery and the rule. ... It steps in between and shuts off from us the light of heaven," "Note well," Buber directs, "not the I-It relationship itself, without which no earthly persistence of human existence is conceivable, but its hybus over-striding all measure is meant."[6] Iqbal holds that knowledge is gained through the senses, and as a source of physical power knowledge must necessarily be controlled by a higher value -- love, if it is not to prove corroding to man (as is the case at the present time). The higher form of knowledge comes through intuition or love. Love, an intuitive perception, gives meaning for life and transforms the intellect into a channel of blessing for mankind. So he suggests: "Lay aside intellect and swim with the wave of love, from this rivulet are produced pearls." And he continues: "when the self gets strengthened by love, it acquires the power to control the universe."[7] Suzuki seems to imply too that many times this rule of I-It is evidenced by the willingness of Westerners to consider their fellow men a commodity to be manipulated. The "outer-directedness" of which Riesman complains in The Lonely Crowd is more than simply a phase of Western culture. It is the disease, the sickness that seems to characterize Western man when his technological advancements and feat make him domineering and arrogant.[8] And Buber comes out with his age-long, and timely suggestion: enter into relation, an I-Thou relation where there is a responsibility of an I for a Thou. This is a relation where a subject encounters another subject as a thou, be it a human being, a thing or intelligible being. R. Otto's comments on the rational and non-rational elements which constitute the structure of the religious self as compared to a place of cloth in his book, Idea of the Holy,[9] seem fitting:

---

[3] Quoted in A. Schimmel, Gabriel's Wing, p. 133. See Iqbal's The Reconstruction of Religious Life in Islam, p. 100, as mentioned above in Chapter V.

[4] Suzuki, et al., Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, pp. 12, 28.

[5] Idem.

---

[6] Buber, Eclipse of God, p. 129; see also Philosophy of Martin Buber, pp. 715-16.

[7] Iqbal, Secrets of the Self, p. 28.

> ... the non-rational factors may be thought of as the warp of the cloth and the rational as the woof, the threads running at right angles to the warp. No cloth can hang together without both, one being just as important as the other. So, in the religious life we need both the warp of religion, those primitive, partly conscious, ineffable and primitive impulses that give warmth, color, and power to the religious life, and its woof, the conceptualizing, guiding, and critical factors of religion.[10]

Man the Indivisible Unit

The biblical view of man, which is notable for the absence of any trace of body-soul dualism, find echoes in Buber, Iqbal and Suzuki. This fact makes one grateful for

---

[8] Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. I, No. 2, Spring 1965, 153-61.

[9] R. Otto, Idea of the Holy, tr. by J. W. Harvey (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958).

[10] Ibid., p. 46.

5

what he possesses, knowing that his "body is the temple of God." Corollary to this fact is the role of the form and matter, or more accurately put, Buber's basic Hasidic tenet. "Any natural act, if hallowed, leads to God, and nature needs man for what no angel can perform on it, namely, its hallowing."[11] Cox's emphasis on the apparent dichotomy between the religious and the secular[12] seems to have been raised, if not denied, to a higher level, and the modern man can pause to be thankful for his natural environment, material possessions etc. Hallowing extends basically to the natural and social life, for here alone the whole man, as God has created him, enters into the hallowing. Iqbal supports this view: "In Islam, God and the universe, spirit and matter, church and state, are organic to each other. Man is not the citizen of a profane world to be renounced in the interest of a world of spirit situated elsewhere."[13] Suzuki, who mistakenly attributes this nature-man dichotomy to the biblical account,[14] is substantially in accord with Buber and Iqbal when he writes: "... Nature produces Man out of itself. Man cannot be outside of nature, he still has his being rooted in nature. Therefore there cannot be any hostility between them. On the contrary, there must always be a friendly understanding between man and Nature...."[15]

---

[11] Buber, The Way of Man, p. 6.

[12] Cox, The Secular City.

[13] Iqbal, Speeches and Statements, pp. 3-12, quoted in De Bary (ed.) Sources of Indian Tradition, p. 764.

[14] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism, ..., p. 230.

We have said in the beginning of this chapter that for Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal whose orientations, background and attitudes are different from each other, man can be a point of conversation. Man can be the springboard from which they can have a contact or dialogue without the ideas of converting one from one religious tradition to another, devoid of the "holier-than-thou-art" attitude and other negative attitudes or destructive, unhealthy attempts.

Self and Community

Buber, Iqbal and Suzuki, as we labored to know their views on personhood, have proven what Whitehead, in his Adventures of Ideas has said: "the importance of man as the supreme organism is beyond question. With all his shortcomings in image, attribute, and deed he deserves to be visited by Him who has ordained the stars."[16] Man may have all the shortcomings, weaknesses, and commit all kinds of mistakes whether by omission or commission, showing the finitude of human nature. On the other hand, Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal challenge us to think of the divine spark in him which reveals those potentialities for creativity, freedom, values, goodness, wholeness, authenticity, and relation. Psalm 8 which speaks of God's concern for this man calls our attention to man's crown and glory -- portraying the dimension of infinitude in man.

---

[15] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism, ..., p. 230.

[16] Alfred Whitehead, Adventures of Ideas.

More specifically we are constantly challenged to recognize that "in every concrete individual, there is uniqueness that defies all formulation." William James explains, "we can feel the touch of it and recognize its taste, so to speak, relishing or disliking, as the case may be, but we can give no ultimate account of it, and have in the end simply to admire the creator."[17] Buber and Iqbal and Suzuki recognize the relevance of this truth, though perhaps Suzuki is non-commital on the vertical dimension of life. It is true he speaks of the inner life which generally leads one to think not only of man but also of the Christian's Creator whose kingdom is within man himself, still he would not go along with Buber and Iqbal on what Hutchison calls the correlative or polar concepts: God and man.[18] Suzuki can join without hesitation in a friendly debate or conference on life's issues if the starting session is on man which is a pedagogically expedient means, rather than from the assumption that God is the logical and ontological foundation of other religious concepts.[19]

---

[17] William James, Memories and Studies (Harper, Row, 1916), p. 109.

[18] Hutchison, Faith, Reason and Existence, pp. 63-89.

[19] Ibid.

Speaking of the "secrecy in oneself," all three men we have been studying suggest some stages (of some sort) of spiritual growth. Buber, as illusive as he is in indicating some guidelines, or metaphysical beliefs in one's way of living and acting daily, refers to the traditional biblical insights and ethical injunctions, while at the same time emphasizing the wholeness and decision of one's response to whatever claims man at a particular time and space. In short, Buber is saying that "each must discover and acquire for himself in a work that demands of him the best possibilities of his soul but also presents him with a treasure that suffices for his existence."[20] Buber prescribes no book of principles in hand into which one could look at times for how he is to decide in a given situation. Offering no system of ethics which is universally valid, Buber is aware of man's sense of right and wrong. Man can never be the sole and uncertain judge of what he ought to do, Buber thinks, but man "must understand himself as standing every moment under the judgment of God."[21] "Both, the human faith not less than the human conscience, can err ever again. And knowing about this their erring, both conscious not less than faith, must place themselves in the hands of Grace."[22]

---

[20] Philosophy of Martin Buber, p. 718.

[21] Ibid., p. 719.

[22] Buber, The Knowledge of Man, p. 148.

Some may want to have Buber to be more definite and clear in providing some ethical rules and regulations.

He fails to supply much needed specific and concrete principles and statements of guidance and direction for ascertaining true theophanies of God as one relates himself to people, the world, and intelligible beings. While science may have the omnicompetent objectivity, one may inquire as to whether there is such a thing as enslaving subjectivity. Indeed Buber may be vulnerable at this point; on the other hand his recognition of the naturalness of the It-world and his insistence upon the reality of the other, which man must affirm, are some of his weapons of defense. His appeal to the Thou is for Buber no reason to wallow in subjectivity. He is in other words pointing out that man lives in two worlds (Thou-world and It-world) and when he struggles to make his haven of rest and security in one alone something is amiss. As a result, the charge of subjectivity to which mysticism and personalism are subjected cannot be altogether true because he maintains the objective otherness and over-againstness of the world, and believes that all persons are united in a common relationship to God.

Both Iqbal and Suzuki have guidelines for man's inner growth and conduct such as the three stages of evolutionary growth in Iqbal,[23] and Suzuki's ten stages of spiritual cow-herding. Both are in accord with Buber's emphasis on the here and now of human existence. Iqbal relies heavily on the Quran for guidance, foundation and insights. Zen, Suzuki summarizes, is after all a simple discipline and teaching:

---

[23] See Chapter IV of this essay and Chapter III too. See Iqbal's The Secrets of the Self and Suzuki's Essays in

> To do goods
> To avoid evils
> To purify one's own heart:
> This is the Buddha-way.[24]

Buber, Iqbal and Suzuki have underscored the importance of relation. They point to us that self-growth and development, especially Buber and Iqbal, are nourished and deepened in the community of persons. Of course Buber delineates more fully when he talked of the three spheres around which this relation arises, namely; with things, and world, with fellow men and spiritual beings."[25] He continues: "The lines of relation meet in the eternal Thou."[26] We have time and again told what and how Iqbal, Buber and Suzuki emphasize relation, but suffice this to briefly summarize their views: "no man is an island indeed."

Zen Buddhism, pp. 371-76.

[24] Suzuki, et al., *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis*, p. 76.

[25] Pfeutze suggests that God is a part of the triad, but I don't think He is for when we do say He is, then the eternal thou (who to Buber can never be an It) is at the level of things, man, etc., both in classifying him and also in relation. See Buber, *I and Thou*, p. 73.

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9.

Man, Speech and Symbol

Buber, Iqbal and Suzuki have shown that man is animal Symbolimum, the creature of language. They have used words and other human symbols to bring man back to reality and for man to relate in a more wholesome articulate way. Man, they indicate, is able to stand off and reflect on the meaning and value of symbols, to recognize their communicative function. Accordingly, man is a *homo faber*. Buber and Iqbal mentioned the technology or tool making of man even as they are aware that man lives in a two-fold world -- the world of *experiencing* and *using*, and the world of *relation*. Man's difference from animal tools can be traced to man's gifts of self-awareness, of freedom to choose and decide, and of the potentialities for creativity.

Meaning is reflected in and manifested in and around things and in the world, Buber, Suzuki and Iqbal seem to indicate to us. Zen is everyday activities; reality is here and now. This universe is language itself, Buber notes. More specifically, Buber and Iqbal believe that God who enriches man's life speaks constantly to every human man; and His presence is active in human existence.

A corollary to this insight is the positive acceptance of life in Buber's, Iqbal's, and Suzuki's thoughts. Tagore's words ring true in this respect: "Thou hast pressed the signet of eternity upon many a fleeting moment of my life."[27]

---

[27] Tagore, *Gitanjali* (Boston: International Pocket Library), p. 10.

One Zen student declares: "no parapsychic experiences, as far as I am aware. But you wake up in the morning and the world seems so beautiful you can hardly stand it." "With this perception of life's goodness there comes of course an objective outlook on the relation of oneself to others, their welfare appearing as important as one's own."[28]

In Zen, the dualisms of self and object, of self and others are transcended. As they fade, there grows upon one a feeling of infinite responsibility to all things here, now and tomorrow. Buber, Iqbal (and Suzuki possibly) sing with Dag Hammarskjold:

> I don't know who or what put the question, I don't know when it was put. I don't even remember answering. But at some moment I did answer Yes to Someone or Something and from that hour I was certain that existence is meaningful and that, therefore, my life, in self-surrender had a goal. From that moment I have known what it means "not to look back," and "to take no thought for the morrow."[29]

Daring to say Yes and to experience a meaning, Hammarskjold encourages us to live the life of Zen who is never drawn away from the world but returns to it with things in new perspective. Whenever man finds himself in the I-It world, he brings to it the glimpse of the Thou,[30] Buber observes. Iqbal can declare with the Zennists who said: "All is one, one in none, none in all." Living with the Taoists' "creative quietude," a Zen has that divine ordinariness."

---

[28] Quoted in H. Smith, The Religions of Man, p. 150.

[29] Hammarskjold, Markings, pp. 100, 169, 176, 199 f.

[30] See A. Maslow, Psychology of Being (New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Co. Inc., 1962), for a psychological treatment.

> My daily activities are not different
> Only I am naturally in harmony with them.
> Taking nothing, renouncing nothing
> In every circumstance no hindrance,no conflict.
> Drawing water, carrying firewood,
> This is the supernatural power, this
> marvelous activity. [31]

God in the Community

Man is also *homo religiosus*. He worships; he has gods. Both Buber and Iqbal are explicit in their assertion and recognition that the self lives in many communities, relations and dimensions including the vertical dimension "in the eternal thou the extended lines of relations meet." This God confronts man as the most general and supreme other. Suzuki may not expressedly refer to this God who confronts man but "in satori there is always what we may call a sense of the Beyond; the experience indeed is my own but I feel it to be rooted elsewhere."[32]

Going back behind the rationalistic commentaries and mystic speculations to the original Quranic teachings, Iqbal describes God first and last as an Ego: His name Allah, as

---

[31] H.Smith, *Religions of the World*, p. 151. See also W.S.Smith, *Faith of Other Men*, Confucian Section.

[32] Suzuki, *Zen Buddhism*, ..., p. 105.

He calls himself in the Quran, shows His personalistic character.[33] In The Secrets of the Self, Iqbal writes: "God Himself as an individual, He is the most unique individual."[34] 112th Sura, the short confession of God's unity which is of paramount importance to Islamic thought, supports Iqbal's description of God's Egohood.[35] Iqbal shares here the view of Tillich on the importance of "God with whom I have a person-to-person encounter. He is the subject of all the symbolic statements in which I express my ultimate concern."[36]

Buber seems to convey the same idea when he writes of the Eternal Thou who is "the Mysterium Tremendum that appears and overthrows: but He is also the mystery of the evident nearer to me than my I."[37] On the other hand, Buber believes that we cannot know"God-in-Himself". We can only know Him as a person, since this is the way He meets us in an I-Thou relation.[38]

---

[33] Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thoughts in Islam, p. 62.

[34] Iqbal, The Secrets of the Self, p. 32.

[35] For complete description of Iqbal's ideas of God, please see The Reconstruction of Religious Thoughts in Islam where "God, the Ultimate Ego, takes in Himself the infinite fulness of life but His infinity is intensive, not extensive. It involves an infinite series, but is not that series."p.64. A.Schimmel opines that Iqbal has avoided as much as possible the mystical definition of the Divine. Gabriel's Wings, p.101.

[36] Tillich, Love, Power and Justice, p. 109.

[37] Buber, I and Thou, p. 79.

In short, Buber and Iqbal seem to share the idea of the "Infinite personality".[39] The problem before Iqbal is how can the Divine Ego, this infinite and overwhelming Being be compatible with personality?[40] The emphasis Iqbal places on the personality of God which transcends every imaginable personality is one of his contributions to the reconstruction of Islamic thought. Now what he cannot adequately describe in regard to the relation of the Ultimate Ego and the created egos, Buber may be able to present a feasible delineation of the relation- the personal relation between God and man. Buber in his definition of religion as the "covenant of the absolute with the particular, - revelation in the 'lived concrete'" affirms this point.[41]

---

[38] Diamond's warning that persons as we know them are limited whereas God as we meet Him in an I-Thou dialogue is without bounds is timely. The absolute character of His personality limits us to any statement that defines Him within a system or an idea. Martin Buber, The Jewish Existentialist, p. 81.

[39] Iqbal's problem on the view of "Infinite personality" which seems contradictory and exclusive with the concept of Divine Ego may be regarded and compared with those of European thinkers. See A.Schimmel, Gabriel's Wings, pp. 86.

[40] Some commentators of Iqbal accused him of having developed an unlogical concept of an "infinite personality" (how can this Divine Ego which cannot be described by human words be compatible with personality?). See Syed Nazir Niazi, Conversations with Iqbal in Muhammad Iqbal, German-Pak Forum, p. 118.

[41] This is Buber's theme in most of his works especially in his I and Thou. This quotation is taken from I and Thou.

All three men have proven Vlastos's statement to be true: "The religious man is not the attractive personality. He does not draw men to himself. He is the transparent personality; a window to something beyond himself. He does not make admirers. He does not dazzle men with a fascinating individuality. He challenges them to supreme loyalty."[42] The first half of this may not be equally true and applicable as the second part since all three men have admirers and I think they have fascinating personalities. All three are windows to something beyond which Smith aptly calls "the transcendent itself". "I do not assert, flatly, that God is not unknown outside the Christian community...God is known and is active in other communities...."[43] Le Fevre expresses it this way: "In all events God is present --incognito. Here we find the possibility that human loneliness can be overcome. We discover that we are not alone. The mysterious good, the greater love, is present with us and for us."[44] Let Buber say it: "Because this human being exists, in the darkness the light lies hidden, in fear salvation, and in the callousness of one's fellowmen, the great love."[45]

---

[42] Quoted in The Choice is Always Ours, pp. 37, 367.

[43] W.C.Smith, The Meaning and End of Religion, p. 335.

[44] Le Fevre, The Understanding of Man, p.153.

[45] Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 98.

Certainly Buber and Iqbal can be called mystics -- not the ontological mystic who finds himself absorbed in the big ocean of nothingness. Rather, they are communal mystics who live with others and God in this world of here and now as active participants in the playground of human needs and activities.

What about Suzuki? Does he possess a different type of mysticism, of which the Hindu and Neoplatonic types tend to be extremely monistic, losing man in the Godhead? The classical mysticism claims to effect a union between man and God, and in the ecstatic vision time, space, world and self-awareness disappear. The mystic who tries to achieve this "union" turns away from this world which to some men is only an illusion. Presuming that Suzuki's "sense of the Beyond" or "the transcendent itself"(in Smith's words) is God with whom this mystic tries to unite, I cannot say that Suzuki has this type of mysticism. Let Suzuki support my conclusion:

> To Zen, time and eternity are one....Zen has never espoused the cause of doing nothingness; eternity is our everyday experience in this world of sense-and-intellect, for there is no eternity outside this time-conditionedness. Eternity is possible only in the midst of birth and death, in the midst of time-process. I raise a finger, this is in time, and eternity is seen dancing at the tip of it. When this is translated into terms of space, the one finger contains in it the three thousand chiliocosms. This is not symbolism. To Zen it is an actual experience. [46]

Again, he maintains that:

---

[46] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism, ..., p. 266.

> ...the enlightenment-experience is not devoid of the great compassionate heart(mahakaruna), but, so far, historical circumstances have prevented its asserting itself in this direction. Zen is socially minded as much as any other religion, but this has been manifested or demonstrated more individualistically, owing to its emphasis upon individual experience. As to serving others in social ways, Zen has had its own way of doing it. 47

Does Suzuki then seek perfect communion of men with God or the union of man and God? Suzuki is certainly not the communal mystic who lives with others and God, and who actively participates in the here-and-now activities of living. On the other hand, I cannot deny that Suzuki and the Zen disciples do not have that gift of mahakaruna (great compassionate heart) which they manifest in their dealings with their fellow human beings. Neither should I forget that most essential point--the satori-experience which has that "sense of the Beyond; the experience indeed is my own but I feel it to be rooted elsewhere."[48] Yes, historically, the emphasis of Zen is upon individual experience. Yet Suzuki and the Zen disciples have their own ways of serving others, sharing their enlightenment experience, "doing goods and purifying one's heart".[49]

---

[47] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism,...,p. 273.

[48] Ibid., p. 105

[49] Suzuki, et. al.(ed), Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 76.

APPENDIX A

Hasidism: Search for Authentic Wholeness and Identity[1]

The Hasidic movement[2] arose in Poland in the eighteenth century, and despite bitter persecution at the hands of traditional Rabbinism, it spread rapidly among the Jews of the eastern Europe until it embraced almost half of them in its ranks. The founder of Hasidism was Rabbi Israel ben Eliezer (1700-60) who is more commonly known as the Baal Shem Tov or the Besht, the master of the good name of God. The Jewish world, to which the Besht brought his message, was torn by the contrasts of the mysticism of Isaac Luria of Safed (1534-1572), the Talmudic legalism which for centuries had been the dominant factor in Jewish life and thinking, and the aftermath of the semi-Messianic movement of Sabbatai Zevi which had continued to gain allegiance among multitudes even after its central hero in 1666 had abandoned Judaism for Islam.[3] He was opposed to retirement from the world and he recommended active involvement in human experience.[4]

---

[1] This is the title of a 36-page research paper on Hasidism which I wrote for a Seminar Course on Religious Experience East and West.

[2] "The insistence upon individual experience is by no means the exclusive possession of Christian groups or persons," explains Hutchison in an effort to explain the idea of religious experience. In Judaism, for example, Hutchison explains, "the Hasidic movement protested against the massive learning and formal traditions of rabbis by an appeal to the immediacy of mystical experience."

The Hebrew word "hasid" means "pious." It is derived from the noun hesed, meaning loving kindness, mercy or grace. It also means steadfast love. The term as mentioned previously is derived from the name of the "Chassidim" who were opponents of the Hellenizers in pre-Maccabean Palestine, and who were the precursors of the Pharisees, from whose ranks, some scholars maintain, Jesus himself arose.

The greatest contemporary interpreter of Hasidism, Buber has a highly selective taste and reading of Hasidic tales, sayings, anecdotes and stories. His first concern has been to convey the power and marvelous depth of the best factors of the movement and not to give a balanced historical study of the development.[5]

---

[3] The social and economic conditions of the Polish Jewry during the eighteenth century were in a deplorable state. The masses were the target of religious incitement by the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical group. The secular authorities objected to onerous taxes. Pogroms were frequent. The ritual murder charge was promoted to challenge the mass of common people against Jewish communities. Opportunities for general education program was almost non-existent, and the moral climate was at its nadir. To balance the despair and tribulations of the Jewish populace, Besht and his followers began their ministry which emphasized the joyous affirmation of life, simplicity and devotion. He counseled against asceticism and self-affliction, and instead he preached the hallowing of all passions and cheer in the service of God. (H. Rabinowicz, Guide to Hasidism, New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1960).

[4] Hasidism, which had to wait until the twentieth century to receive a realistic valuation, had a share of historians, writers and philosophers. Among them are Simon Dubnow, Martin Buber, S. A. Horodezky, Gershon G. Scholem, Eliezer Steinmann and Hillel Zeitlin who entered "the Pardes", the Garden of Hasidism, and assigned the movement an honorable position in the chronicle of religious revivals.

Some of the Hasidic teachings which will give more light to Buber's philosophy of dialogue are:

1. Hasidism represents a type of mysticism, which is derived partly from Kabbalism.[6] Hasidism does not deny the world or sway man to be away from community. Intense communal and brotherly life is the keynote of this movement.

Speaking of the Hasidic presentation of the doctrine of the sparks, Buber writes:

> There is no reason to fast, as he who eats with devotion redeems the fallen sparks enclosed in the food ... There is no reason to do without love of husband or wife, for where a man and woman are together in holy unity, there the Shekhinah (Divine Presence) rests over them ... the essential point to Hasidism is that man exerts influence on the eternal, and that this is not done by any special works, but by the

---

[5] Newman supplies the historical background of this movement, whereas Buber with his own peculiar intensity, disciple of mind and spirit, emphasized and adapted those elements of its teachings which have direct relevance and significance on our contemporary problems. (Gershom Scholem in his book, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, New York: Schocken Books, 1946, Ninth Lecture; J. G. Weiss, "Contemplative Mysticism and Faith in Hasidic Piety," *The Journal of Jewish Studies*, Vol. IV, No. 1, 1953.) Ernst Simon, Martin Buber and the Faith of Israel, Iyyun, Hebrew Philosophical Quarterly, Vol. X, No. 1, 1958, 23 ff.

[6] One principal teaching of Kabbalism is that man is responsible for the fate of God of the world, thus man has influence upon cosmic and eternal happenings and situations. The indwelling divine sparks or splendor which permeate the world can be brought about by man. Man is responsible for the redemptive task of re-uniting the God of Holy with his world--in dwelling glory.

> intention with which he does all his works. It is the teaching of the hallowing of the every-day.[7]

The daily life of the Jew was infused with redemptive significance, for this act of liberating or raising the sparks was understood as a messianic activity that would bring the final consummation--the coming of the Messianic Era.

2. The understanding of love is another teaching of Hasidism. The Zaddik, or the leader, has constantly encouraged his followers that everyone including the wicked or unlovable must be loved since "the soul of every man is a divine particle from above. Even so you have to show pity to God when one holy spark of His has been trapped in a shell."[8]

"Father complained to the Besht that his son had forsaken God. 'What, Rabbi, shall I do?' 'Love him more than ever' was the Besht's reply. This is one of the famous sayings of Baal Shem Tov. Buber's comment is "that here the decisive step has been taken. For as the primeval source of the Deity is linked up with all its soul-sparks which are dispersed through the world, so whatever we do to our fellow-men is bound up with what we do to God." One may right away be reminded of the two greatest commandments in the New Testament which Jesus has taught his disciples: Love thy God ..., and love thy neighbor as thyself. These are found of course in Leviticus 6:5, and 19:18, as well as Matthew.

---

[7] Buber, Hasidism, p. 171.

[8] Ibid.

3. Songs and dances express the joy and fervor of Hasidism. There are many stories as well as sayings which show the Hasidic emphasis on the quality of fervor. "Said the Besht: No child can be born except through pleasure and joy. By the same token, if one wishes his prayers to bear fruit, he must offer them with pleasure and joy."[9] "It is necessary to live and to serve God in a cheerful and happy frame of mind: sadness and sorrow darken the soul and interfere with communion; hence the injuriousness of ascetism."[10]

"Weeping is an exceeding great evil, for man must serve in joy. If, however, weeping comes through joy, then it is an exceeding great good. ..."[11]

4. Buber has found in Hasidism a "metaphically positive attitude toward language as God's own instrument," writes Scholem.[12] Speech is communication itself. Scholem explains: "Language in its purest form, that is Hebrew ...

---

[9] L. Newman, The Hasidic Anthology, p. 203.

[10] The Jewish Encyclopedia, p. 253.

[11] The Wisdom of Israel, p. 558.

[12] See Mamre pp. 4.101, 175 ff., Hasidism, pp. 96, 121 ff.

reflects the fundamental spiritual nature of the world; in other words, it has a mystical value. Speech reaches God because it comes from God. Man's common language ... reflects the creative language of God. All ... all that lives, is an expression of God's language, and what is it that Revelation can reveal in the last resort if not the name of God?"[13]

---

[13] Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, pp. 17-18.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Major Writings of Martin Buber

Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. Translated by R. Gregor Smith. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1937.

__________. *Moses*. Oxford: East & West Library, 1946. Harper Torchbook, 1958.

__________. *Mamre: Essays in Religion*. Translated by Great Hort. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1946.

__________. *Between Man and Man*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1947.

__________. *Ten Rungs: Hasidic Sayings*. New York: Schocken Books, 1947.

__________. *Tales of the Hasidim*, Vol. 1. *The Early Masters*: Vol. II. *The Later Masters*. New York: Schocken Books, 1947-48.

__________. *Hasidism*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948.

__________. *Israel and the World*. New York: Schocken Books, 1948.

__________. *The Prophetic Fraith*. Translated by Carlyle Witton-Davies. New York: Macmillan Co., 1949.

__________. *Paths in Utopia*. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. New York: Macmillan Co., 1950.

__________. *The Ways of Man According to the Teachings of Hasidism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1950.

__________. *Two Types of Faith*. Translated by Norman P. Goldhawk. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951. Harper & Brothers, 1952. Harper Torchbook, 1960.

__________. *At the Turning*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Young, 1952.

__________. *Eclipse of God*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952. Harper Torchbook, 1957.

__________. *Israel and Palestine.* New York: Farrar, Straus & Young, 1952.

__________. *Right and Wrong: An Interpretation of Some Psalms*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1952.

__________. *Good and Evil: Two Interpretations*. (Includes Images of Good and Evil and Right and Wrong.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

__________. *For the Sake of Heaven*. Second edition with new Foreword. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953. Paperback edition-Meridain Books, 1958.

__________. *Pointing the Way: Collected Essays*. Translated by Maurice S. Friedman. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

__________. *Hasidism and Modern Man*. Edited and translated by Maurice Friedman. New York: Horizon Press, 1958.

__________. *The Writings of Martin Buber.* Edited with Introduction by Will Herberg. New York: Meridian Books, 1958.

__________. *The Origin and Meaning of Hasidism*, Vol. II of *Hasidism and the Way of Man*. Edited and translated by Maurice Friedman, New York: The Horizon Press, 1960.

B. Writings about Martin Buber

Kohn, Hans. "The Religious Philosophy of Martin Buber," *Menorah Journal*, XXVI (1938), 173-85.

Smith, R. Gregor. *The Thought of Martin Buber*. (Burning Glass Paper No. 18) Shorne, Kent: Ridgeway House, 1946.

Simon, Ernest. "Martin Buber: His Way Between Thought and Deed," *Jewish Frontier*, XV (February 1948), 25-28.

Tillich, Paul. "Martin Buber's New View of Evil," *Theology Today*, XII (July 1953) 239-46.

Friedman, Maurice S. "Martin Buber's and Christian Thought," Commentary, V (1948) 515-21.

Smith, Ronald Gregor, "The Theology of Martin Buber," Theology Today, XII (1955) 206-15.

Cohen, Arthur A. Martin Buber, Studies in Modern European Literature and Thought. New York: Hillary House, 1957.

Murchland, Bernard G. "Buber's Pursuit of the Holy," The Commonwealth, LXVIII (1958) 469-71.

Trapp, Jacob, Editor. To Hallow This Life, An Anthology of Martin Buber's Writings. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

Diamond, Malcolm. Martin Buber: Jewish Existentialist. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Pfeutze, Paul. The Self, Society and Existence. New York: Harper and Sons.

C. Major Writings of Daisetz T. Suzuki

Suzuki, Daisetz T. Introduction to Zen Buddhism. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949.

____________. Japanese Buddhism. Board of Tourist Industry, 1938.

____________. Mysticism: Christian and Buddhist. World Perspective, Vol. 12, Harper, 1957.

____________. Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1907.

____________. Studies in Zen. Philosophical Library.

____________. Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk. Illus. by Z. Sato. University Books, 1959.

____________. Zen and Japanese Buddhism. Tuttle, 1958.

____________. Zen and Japanese Buddhism, Rev. and enl. 2nd ed. Pantheon, 1959 (First published in 1938 under the title: Zen Buddhism and Its Influence on Japanese Culture.)

______________. *Essays in Zen Buddhism*. First Second and Third Series. London: Rider, 3. Vol. I, 1927; II, 1933; III, 1934.

______________. *Living by Zen Buddhism*. Rider Co., 1949-55.

______________. *Manuel of Zen Buddhism*. Rider Co., 1949.

______________. *Studies in Zen Buddhism*. Rider Co., 1949.

______________. *The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind*; Their Significance of Sutra of Hui-neng. London, New York: Pub. for the Buddhist Society, Rider, 1949.

______________, et al., Editors. *Zen Buddhism and Psycho-analysis*. Harper, 1960.

______________. *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra*, 1930.

______________. *An Index to the Lankavatara Sutra*, 1933.

______________. *Critical Edition of the Ganadavhuha Sutra*. (With H. Idzumi) 1934-36.

______________. *Buddhist Philosophy and Its Effects on the Life and Thoughts of the Japanese People*. 1936.

D. Books on Suzuki selected and edited by other authors

Suzuki. *Essentials of Zen Buddhism*. Selected from Suzuki, edited and Introduction by B. Philipps. Dutton, 1962.

Suzuki. *Zen Buddhism*. Edited and Introduction by W. Barrett. New York: Doubleday, 1956.

Chang Chen-chi. *The Practice of Zen*. New York: Harper, 1959.

Nakamura, Hajime. *Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples: India Tibet, China, Japan*. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1964.

E. Books on Zen Buddhism Etc. by other authors

Pratt, J. *The Pilgrimage of Buddhism*.

Humphreys, C. *Zen Buddhism*.

Conze, E. *Buddhism*. Oxford: Bruno Cassier, 1951.

Suzuki, B. L. *Mahayana Buddhism, A Brief Outline*. London: David Marlowe, Ltd., 1948.

Burtt, E. A. *The Teachings of the Compassionate Buddha*. New York: The New American Library, Mentor Books, 1955.

Morgan, K. *The Path of the Buddha, Buddhism Interpreted by Buddhists*. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1956.

Ross, F. *The Meaning of Life in Hinduism and Buddhism*.

Smith, Houston. *The Religions of Man*.

Shibayam, Zenkei. *A Flower Does Not Talk*.

Kapleau, P., Editor. *The Three Pillars of Zen*. Harper & Row, 1966.

Philosophy East and West. Vol. III, No. 1, April 1953.

F. Magazines

New Yorker, August 31, 1957.

Current Bibliography, November 1957.

Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 31, 1964.

G. Major Writings of Muhammad Iqbal

Prose

Iqbal, Muhammad. *Ilmul Iqtisad* (*Principles of Economics*) in Urdu, 1901.

______________. *The Development of Metaphysics in Persia*. London: Luzoc & Co., 1908.

______________. *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*. Oxford University Press, 1934.

______________. *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*. Ashraf, Lahore, 1944.

______________. *Speeches and Statements of Iqbal*. Al-Maror, 1944.

________________. *Makateeb-i-Iqbal* (Letters of Iqbal in Urdu).

Poetry (in Urdu)

________________. *Bangi-Dira*.

________________. *Bal-i-Jibrail*.

________________. *Zarb-i-Kalim*.

________________. *Armughan-i-Hijaz*.

Poetry (in Persian)

________________. *Asrar-wa-Rumuz*.

________________. *Payam-i-Mashriq*.

________________. *Zabur-i-Ajam*.

________________. *Javid Namah*.

________________. *Musafir*.

________________. *Pas Chai Bayad Kard*.

________________. *Armughab-i-Hijaz*.

H. Translations of Iqbal's Works in English

Secrets of Self. Translated by R. A. Nicholson. Lahore: Ashraf.

Tulips of Sinai. Translated by A. J. Arberry.

Poems from Iqbal. Translated by V. G. Kiernam. Bombay: Kutb Publishers Ltd.

Persian Psalms. Translated by A.B. Arberry. Lahore: Ashraf.

Complaint and Answers. Translated by Altaf Husain. Lahore: Ashraf.

I. Books on Iqbal

Ali, Sheikh Akbar. *Iqbal: His Poetry and Message*. Lahore: Qaumi Kutub Khana, 1932.

Aspects of Iqbal. Lahore: Qaumi Kutub Khana, 1938.

Beg, Abdulla Anwar. *The Poet of the East*. Lahore: Qau, I Kutub Khana, 1930.

Dar, B. A. *Iqbal's Philosophy of Society, and a Study in Iqbal's Philosophy*. Lahore: Sh Mohd Ashraf, 1933 and 1934 respectively.

Enver, Dr. Ishrat Hasan. *Metaphysics of Iqbal*. Lahore: Sh. Modh Ashraf, 1944.

Iqbal As A Thinker. Lahore: Sh. Mohd Ashraf, 1944.

Khan, Zulfiqar Ali. *A Voice from the East*. Lahore: The Mercantile Electric Press, 1922.

Krishan Roop. *Iqbal*. Lahore: New India Publications, 1945.

Saiayidian, K. G. *Iqbal's Educational Philosophy*. Lahore: Sh. Mohd Ashraf, 1938.

Sinha, Sachchindananda. *Iqbal: The Poet and His Message*. Allahabad: Ram Narian Lal, 1946.

Vahid, S. A. *Iqbal: His Art and Thought*. Lahore: Sh. Mohd. Ashraf, 1944.